

NUMBER

4

URBAN INDIANS

Proceedings of the Third Annual Conference on
Problems and Issues Concerning American Indians
Today

Center for the History of the American Indian

COPYRIGHT 1981

BY

THE NEWBERRY LIBRARY
Chicago, Illinois

This volume is dedicated to the Memory
of Chauncina White Horse (1908-1981), an
inspirational voice in the Chicago
American Indian community and the
moving force of this conference.



THE NEWBERRY LIBRARY CENTER FOR THE HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN INDIAN

ANNOUNCES

THE THIRD ANNUAL CONFERENCE ON
PROBLEMS AND ISSUES CONCERNING AMERICAN INDIANS TODAY

URBAN INDIANS

NEWBERRY LIBRARY
60 WEST WALTON STREET
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS
SATURDAY, 27 SEPTEMBER 1980

Conference Chairman: Professor Alfonso Ortiz (San Juan Tewa)
Department of Anthropology, University of New
Mexico
Chairman, Advisory Committee, NLCHAI

MORNING SESSION, 9:00 a.m.

Introductory Remarks: The Relocation Act and Its Effects
Dr. Sol Tax, Emeritus Professor of Anthropology
University of Chicago

Paper: The National Scene
Professor Russell Thornton (Cherokee)
Department of Sociology, University of Minnesota - Minneapolis

Comment: Charlotte Heth, Acting Director, American Indian Studies
Center, UCLA

Paper: The Indians of Chicago
Dr. Merwyn Garbarino, Chancellor's Office
University of Illinois, Chicago Circle

Comment: Chauncina White Horse (Sioux), National Indian Council on
Aging

Lunch: Fellows Lounge, Newberry Library. 12:30 p.m.

AFTERNOON SESSION, 2:00 p.m.

Paper: The Indians of the San Francisco Bay Area
Dr. Ann Metcalfe, The Institute for Scientific Analysis

Comment: Dr. Jennie Joe (Navajo), The Institute for Scientific
Analysis

Paper: Urban Indian Affairs Policies of the United States and Canada
Professor John Price, Department of Anthropology
York University, Ontario

Summary of Conference: Chairman Ortiz

Reception and refreshments

CHAIRMAN'S INTRODUCTION

By

Dr. Alfonso Ortiz

This is an important gathering today, and we welcome all who are here to discuss and learn about our subject, the urban Indian experience. However one counts Indian peoples in the United States today, at least half, if not more than half, of all Indians live in urban areas or in off-reservation concentrations where the dominant group is non-Indian. Urbanization is a phenomenon, and the present as well as the future of Indian peoples are wedded with it. We can no longer, whatever fields of scholarship we pursue, ignore the fact that at least half of ~~the people with whom we are concerned~~ live in an off-reservation ~~context~~.

In the past it has been ~~all-too-true~~ that we, ~~especially~~ anthropologists, romantics that we are, followed Indians to the cities to find vestiges of "tribal" life, concentrating almost exclusively on understanding how they managed to survive as culturally "Indian" in the urban context. That kind of research is fine as far as it goes, but as Ann Metcalf's paper on Indians in the San Francisco Bay area will show, the romantic quest for evidence of survivals and vestiges of tribal cultures is very myopic. As she will relate in her presentation, there are impressive examples of creative, dynamic and successful adjustments made by Indian people in urban settings. Those of you from the Chicago Indian community have another excellent example of the successful urban Indian experience as our commentator, Chauncina White Horse, will underscore in her presentation today.

Therein lies the fascination with the urban Indian experience--a creative synthesis of a people faced with assimilating new ways, of somehow creating a blend of old ways and new. This synthesis permits retaining the integrity of the old but also permits adjustment to the new. I will not go any further because we have invited distinguished scholars and guests to discuss this very topic. Dr. Sol Tax, Professor Emeritus of Anthropology at The University of Chicago will lead off with introductory remarks on "The Relocation Act and Its Effects." Professor Tax has been one of the more unconventional minds in the field of American Indian studies and as such is concerned with unconventional things like urbanization of Indian peoples. In fact, he has been interested in this subject for a long, long time and, as most of you know, has made tremendous contributions toward our understanding of Indians in urban societies.

Following Sol Tax, Professor Russell Thornton of the Department of Sociology at The University of Minnesota will present an overview of the national urban scene of Indians within the United States. Commenting on Professor Thornton's paper will be another Cherokee, Professor Charlotte Heth, Director of the American Indian Studies Center at The University of California at Los Angeles. Following Professor Heth, Dr. Merwyn Garbarino, Professor of Anthropology at The University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, will present a paper entitled, "The Indians of Chicago." Commenting on Professor Garbarino's paper will be Chauncina White Horse, a distinguished Sioux who has been living in Chicago for some time,

and who is currently a member of the National Indian Council on Aging.

Following a luncheon break we will have two additional papers in an afternoon session. Dr. Ann Metcalf of The Institute for Scientific Analysis in San Francisco will discuss "The Indians of the San Francisco Bay Area." Her commentator is Dr. Jennie Joe, also of the Institute for Scientific Analysis and a representative of the Navajo tribe. The final paper of the day will be on "Urban Indian Affairs Policies of the United States and Canada" by Professor John Price of York University's Department of Anthropology.

Before Professor Tax begins, I would like to introduce a final guest who is familiar to many of you in the audience. Lucille St. Germaine, a Winnebago and Principal of Little Big Horn High School here in Chicago, is as knowledgeable on today's subject as anyone here. She recently told me that she has been in the city a little over twenty-five years. That certainly makes her an expert on this city's large Indian community, and we welcome her among the panelists.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS:
THE RELOCATION ACT AND ITS EFFECTS

Sol Tax
University of Chicago

I have been privileged to have been around American Indians longer than most of you have been around, and when it comes to participating in a conference which has as its guests many of my Indian teachers, I am especially embarrassed because I know that they know much more than I. I have learned some things over the years and have a little more confidence in my judgment than I used to. I start out by expressing a very genuine observation. As I become older I see that a lifetime is not enough time to understand one's self unless you're a non-thinking person. By the time one becomes old enough to realize that you don't know what you know; you don't know what it's all about. At that point it's called wisdom, but usually you have to keep quiet by that time in life.

The idea of knowing your whole culture then, as an anthropologist might define it, or knowing anybody else's culture is second degree removed from knowing your own which no single person can possibly do in its entirety, eclectic as a person might be. We in anthropology are wholistic and think this essential for understanding parts of culture in context. One can't know everything about one's self; one can't know one's own society; one certainly can't know another culture.

With American Indians, one major point should be made--perhaps the most important thing I have learned in my lifetime about Indian peoples. There is no such thing as "an American Indian culture." There are hundreds of Indian cultures. If you think about Europe or Asia, you know that. The Japanese are different from the Chinese; the Germans are different from

the French. Historians, anthropologists, sociologists, economists--all are specialists in certain aspects of certain areas of specific knowledge and research. I have a daughter who happens to be a specialist on Spain. She knows she does not have time in her lifetime to know even a fraction of the total on aspects of her specialty. As her father I often encourage her to go beyond her specific knowledge and to generalize. A scholar involved in a complex culture is never going to know everything about that culture.

The point I wish to make is that there are a hundred Spains; two hundred Spains; five Spains. The more I learn about American Indian groups, the more I appreciate the richness of the tapestry. One can know a small amount about the Mesquakies in Iowa, where I started my work, or the Apaches--and specifically, the Mescalero Apaches--where over fifty years ago I first came to know a little about North American Indians, but each of the peoples are as different one from another as any nation in the world is different in many respects from any other nation in the world.

Nor is it just a matter of asking, "what are they like now?" What the tapestry is now is nothing comparable to what is in their minds, combining past and present. Not only do we not have, as my daughter in Spain has--many historical documents spanning a thousand years of history--we have other complex problems as well when researching topics in American Indian studies. We have to gather materials from oral sources and we have to understand that this form of remembering is just as important to them as the historical background of their heritage and the context of their respective cultures as our historical documents are to us in the

context of our Western Judeo-Christian tradition. Both are complex and both are equally valid and important.

The idea of knowing the definitive answers to anything about the American Indian is ridiculous. One can not know anything about "The American Indian." One can know a little bit more than somebody who is more ignorant than oneself. I have spent these past fifty years meeting people who know less than I do and it's exceedingly painful to start from scratch with each and every one. A common attitude exemplifying this ignorance comes through when I meet individuals who ask, "why are the Indians on reservations and why are we keeping them in concentration camps?"

Right away you can see why the policies of the 1950s were set in motion. This attitude was prevalent then, just as it remains today. Back then, as well as today, I continue to explain to these sorts of people that the reservations are the American Indians' homes. For all of us who do not live on reservations, what if policy makers decided that our homes are concentration camps; what if they decided that we should be freed from our wives and children; what if they decided that each of you should be freed from the bondage of the roof under which you live.

These are largely educated people that have this attitude about reservations as concentration camps. Often the most educated people in society are also the most dangerous because they are able to articulate ideas and therefore to influence others, write and publish, etcetera. None of us know for sure, but we have learned through experience that one theme stands out

in Indian peoples' collective experiences. That is, that they are survivors who, by and large, live in difficult environments that in many cases have overtaken them. But they have survived because they know how to adjust and change with the times, adapting themselves for survival. The so-called "conservatism" often associated with Indians who have survived simply is not the right term to associate with their experiences. This is a misunderstanding on the part of outsiders who categorize some Indians as "progressives," others as "conservatives." What the American Indian people have done in order to be here today is to survive through the spirit.

This is a lesson I have learned over the years because, at least as much as any other American, ~~or anyone whose cultural~~ roots stem from the Western tradition, I am not spiritual. I am a secularist if there ever was one. The idea and the discovery that everyone, including myself, has to live by something that is explicable in mechanistic terms, and that American Indians have learned to live through the spirit, not in terms of the simple, mechanical adaptations to the environment common to Western man is the root of the explanation for why Indians have survived. They survived because of a tremendous will to survive because it is important for them to do so spiritually as well as physically.

This will to survive and the experience of surviving have been different, not only for each tribal group, but for each individual within those various groups as well. When one realizes this among American Indians as a whole, it becomes possible to see that in recent times, and specifically, within the past three decades, they have moved in large numbers to the cities. We have described this as "relocation."

"Relocation" has never been a part of the law of the land. I looked for that several times without success. There never was an act with a title of that sort. The Bureau of Indian Affairs in the 1950s was in a mood that promoted termination. There was a Joint Resolution 108 and a number of other statutes that reflected Congressional desire to terminate trust relationships with American Indian tribes. But relocation was not an act. It was a program which began in 1952. The idea was to terminate the older policy of developing and supporting reservations by helping Indians to assimilate in the general American population. The common feeling at that time within the Bureau was "let them become like us." Congress never stated, "Let's move them into the cities." They did it subtly by changing the Bureau's budget.

What it amounted to was a program started in 1952 that continued for a number of years that was called "The Voluntary Relocation Program." It was voluntary, except that the Bureau placed agents on most of the reservations whose job it was to recruit "volunteers" to move into the cities. The Indians that they found, generally speaking, were those reservation people who were not getting along very well at home. These were the prime candidates the agents persuaded to leave.

If you could not get along well on your reservation and you assumed that you would do better by going to an unknown city, it meant that you had adapted very well to reservation life. Logically, if a person had not adapted to life at home, why would anyone have assumed that this same person would do well in the city, away from his own culture? The important thing about this attitude and the historical reality that this was a one-way ticket

situation where bureaucrats filled their quotas as outlined in the relocation program, is that the Bureau only went part of the way in fulfilling their obligations of the program. They gave the individual a one-way ticket, found housing in one of five major cities initially for that person, and placed that person in a job situation. Then after about six months, they forgot about that individual entirely.

There were some, the lucky few, who were ready and willing to try some alternative. For them, the city experience might be described as successful change. For the majority of the people relocated to cities, however, the experience was not so good. When the American Indian Center of Chicago was at 411 La Salle Street I remember very well ~~being called there for a~~ meeting to discuss the relocation program. ~~At that time the~~ head of the program was a man named Miller who made his home in Denver, another city selected for the program. I spoke to him about the philosophy of the program, criticizing it as a negative program and offering an alternative to make it a positive one. I thought that it should have been an educational program where people come and learn new ways and lifestyles on a truly voluntary basis. My thought was to give them a round-trip ticket so that after they had learned something about city life and the urban mainstream, they could go back to the reservation and share their educational experiences with other members of their tribes. But the whole philosophy of the Bureau created an impossible situation.

We had a major meeting once downtown with all of the social workers in the city. By then there were thousands of relocated Indians in the city of Chicago. After six weeks they could not

go back to the Bureau for assistance and the Federal Government refused to accept any responsibility. This was still in the 1950s under the Eisenhower regime, long before the War on Poverty, long before any federal interest in funding programs for anybody. There were no funds for assistance for these Indians who had been brought to the cities after the Bureau washed their hands of responsibility. There were some private agencies and a few local public agencies that did what they could to help, but they were strapped by lack of funds as well. From their perspective, the Indians were a problem. From this, the situation worsened and became what I would describe in hindsight as a scandal.

I mention that meeting because even ~~Senator Douglas~~ was present. The Bureau of Indian Affairs ~~explained to him~~ and those present that they could not tell The American Indian Center, social agencies or private citizens which trains the Indians were coming into the city on. Their philosophy was that these relocatees were their clients and all information was to be kept confidential. They refused to tell us who was coming and we could not get a list of those who had already arrived under the program. Their interpretation of their role was to see that an Indian was placed on the job and, if that situation was not good, they permitted one change of employment. After that they told their clients to get lost. They wanted nothing else to do with those who were unsuccessful in their judgment to conforming to city life.

This became more scandalous as time went on. There were articles in the papers, meetings, and so on. A few years later the Association on American Indian Affairs made a report on what happened after a few years. The public press finally took up the issue and such journals as Harpers Weekly and others brought the issue to the

attention of the public nationwide. Only then were some changes made. The American Indian Center was finally recognized by the Bureau as an institution that had a right to know about Indians coming into the city. But this took years to accomplish.

If we look now at the whole of Indian affairs, we have tribes, tribal councils on the reservations, federally recognized tribes, etc. Despite the census figures, most of the Indians still live on the reservations, in spirit if not in fact. There are still funds allocated by Congress which has the Constitutional responsibility to Indian tribes, especially those with treaties, but all federally recognized tribes as well. In this continuing situation, there are bound to be conflicts over the money. Everybody thinks so anyway. I remember in 1961 we had a large national conference concerning American Indians at the University of Chicago. It was managed entirely by American Indians. It resulted in a document that was a statement of purpose presented to President Kennedy. For the first time the government was forced to recognize that Indians had a right to come and go into and out of the cities as they pleased and that the federal government's obligations were to non-reservation as well as reservation Indians. By then there were many Indian youth in the cities and it was the beginning of a change in attitude.

Before that conference which has been summarized by Nancy Lurie, everybody worried about the conflicts between city Indians and reservation Indians. Everyone feared that reservation Indians would not come because the conference was steered by city Indians. But the reservation Indians came, perhaps partly to keep the conference and statement from being entirely run by the newly-created

urban Indian organizations. Perhaps they were trying to protect themselves against the non-federally recognized Indians. There were a lot of the latter in Chicago who became involved in the Indian community and in the conference.

The great issue with which all concerned themselves in advance and which was immediately resolved was the presumed conflict of non-reservation Indians of all kinds--those without federal status, those of the eastern half of the United States, those of the cities--with federally recognized reservation Indians. The so-called conflict was very quickly resolved because it became evident at the outset that all Indians--whatever their official status or circumstances of residence--were firmly attached to their tribal identities. There was no feeling that anyone who was Indian was not loyal to his or her own tribe. There was therefore this feeling of consensus. I saw this again two or three years ago when the United States Census Bureau, which as you know has a habit of undercounting minorities, was preparing for the 1980 census claiming that they were really going to accurately count everybody. At a meeting downtown which I attended I was struck by the fact that representatives of the census agency argued with the Indians present that it was to Indians' advantage to cooperate in an accurate count since undercounting would be costly to them, as well as other minorities in the city.

I was a little surprised, although in thinking back, not too surprised, to find a great resistance on the part of the Indians who had gathered together from different organizations who lobbied against a so-called accurate count in that money would be taken from their people back home on the reservations in order

to support Indians in the city. There were not going to move to say we want money for Indians in Chicago if it meant taking money from the reservations. They identified with their home reservations, each and every one of them. None of them would betray their reservations.

I now have read in the most recent issue of Wassaja an article which outlines the definition of an Indian. Apparently the problem is still with us and is largely the result of the Department of Education. They decided to settle the question since they are now responsible for spending all of the money which the federal government allocates for so-called Indian education. They got somebody with the last name of Kahn, a name that doesn't sound Indian of course, to head a commission to define the Indian. He gave half a dozen options. The article describes the reaction of the National Tribal Chairmen's Association representing the tribes and how they rejected each and every one of Kahn's alternative definitions. Their suggestion as a solution was to accept each tribe's own definition of what it considers a member of that specific group to be.

This indicates that there is still much concern on the part of the tribes that many people claim to be Indian but do not have recognition within specific tribes. It also reflects the competition for funds. When you think of the people on the reservations who are federally recognized, they obviously think of cities as places where many non-Indians claim to be Indian.

When I said that the Relocation Program was a scandal, and I sincerely think it was, there was also an indirect result that

benefited some relocated Indians. That result came only after much suffering and alienation. But while suffering, they learned something about the cities. Many of them returned home with a bad impression of the city and their urban experiences, a theme common to many non-Indians as well. Even though their experiences were bad, they learned something that could be transmitted as a learning experience once they returned to their reservation homes. Also, there were a select few in every city involved in the program who adjusted and came to like their new situations. Those back home learned of these people as well and their good experiences. In time, the city-Indian program became what it should have been all along--an educational experience, and a way to earn a living if such was impossible on the reservation.

It is no longer competitive, ~~that is the strength~~ of the tribe in getting Congressional monies is not pitted against non-reservation Indians. And there is more acceptance today of moving in and out of cities. Before reservations Indians moved where they needed to for subsistence and often because they simply wanted to move. Tribes often occupied large hunting territories hundreds of miles across which they knew well and which they relied upon consistently. The cities are part of the territory modern Indians have come to exploit so that they are not totally dependent upon limited resources in rural areas and on the reservations. Part of those resources are the very funds that the reservations cannot get--funds available to all citizens but not set aside exclusively for Indians. If they work it right, and they know this well, they can expand resources for their families and tribe by participating

in urban programs that have nothing to do with Congressional monies allocated for American Indians.

A large question remains unresolved with so many Indians in cities today. This question is whether or not it is possible to get recognition for urban Indians as Indians entitled to the same funds that reservations receive. It seems to me that the way this should be accomplished is to recognize that urban Indians are individuals who are firmly attached to their traditional tribes. If they continue to distinguish reservation-based members of the tribe from those who live outside the tribal boundaries as prescribed by federal reservation physical boundaries, the present system will continue. If, however, the tribes themselves give recognition to their members who firmly identify with the reservation but who have chosen or have been forced for whatever reasons to migrate to the cities, then they can make the federal programs agreed upon in treaties and in law work to both the advantage of the reservation as well as the city. They could then enjoy these programs regardless of whether they were urban or rural tribal members.

At one time I thought that under the Indian Reorganization Act of the 1930s we could get Indians to "reorganize" in cities under democratic organizations that would conform to federal policies. But that would have led federally-recognized reservation "reorganized" governments to resent the reorganized tribes in the cities. Better yet, it would be to all Indians' advantage and much simpler if all those federally-recognized tribes, and especially those with treaties with the United States Government would argue that they should receive the monies from the government and to

then allow all tribal members to benefit in programs whether they live on the reservations or in non-reservation situations. This might work for the federally-recognized tribes, many of whose members are on the tribal rolls but who live in cities and off the reservation.

We must remember, however, that there are many Indians in cities who are members of non-federally recognized tribes or who do not have their names on a tribal roll. Some years back Bob Thomas, who is here today, Sam Stanley and I worked out a map using the Indian census figures from 1950. There were so few Indians in cities then that it scarcely crossed our minds. But we were interested when we discovered how many Indians there were across the country who clearly identified themselves as Indians who were not counted by the official U. S. Census Office as Indians. We didn't care what their legal status was according to Washington or in the various states. We were interested in how they defined themselves. Many of these communities were terminated decades ago; others are remnants of conquered tribes who were never given reservations. They steered us from one community to another across the American landscape. They knew they were Indians even if Washington refused to recognize them as such; they knew other communities of so-called non-status Indians and treated these other communities with respect as fellow Indians of different tribes.

The hope I have for the future is a new relationship between Washington and the White man in general on the one hand and all Indians--whether they reside in the cities or in their home communities; whether they are federally-recognized or lack that status but identify among themselves and with others as Indians on the other hand.

A good relationship between reservation Indians and city Indians as well as what Thomas, Stanley and I described as societal Indians or those whose lands were terminated long ago such as the majority of Indians in Oklahoma, could produce a new creative synthesis of thinking and action that could benefit all of us. There could be much creativity on the part of Indians if they could be freed of some of the prejudices and worries they now have from competition.

Indians will be very creative because they are not really competitive, as I tried to explain earlier. They are afraid, as we all are, until they get to know somebody or some group. Once beyond that, Indians are not competitive. They are cooperative and very generous to one another. And they become extremely creative in their ways of socially organizing things for the benefit of all. I believe it is possible to have a new world with urban and rural Indians cooperating and benefitting each other.

PATTERNS AND PROCESSES OF AMERICAN INDIANS
IN CITIES AND TOWNS: THE
NATIONAL SCENE

by
Russell Thornton

The urbanization of American Indians is not necessarily a recent or even contemporary phenomenon. City life developed (undoubtedly independently) in two regions of the world--the Meso-American area of the Western Hemisphere and the Mesopotamian area of the Eastern Hemisphere (Sjoberg, 1960:26). The dates of these first cities in the world are generally placed at some 5,000 years ago (Davis, 1955:430; Sjoberg, 1960:34). Even restricting oneself to only the area of the Western Hemisphere north of the Rio Grande River, urbanization of American Indians is still ancient. Many American Indian peoples, e.g., the Pueblos and those peoples of the Northwest Coast, have lived in large population concentrations for hundreds, perhaps thousands of years. (These population concentrations were probably not as large, however, as the ones located south of the Rio Grande River.) Also, the so-called "city-state"--a political unit coinciding with an "urban" area--was perhaps as characteristic of certain American Indian peoples as those peoples of Greece or Italy. The Creek are a good example here, I would think. And, then too, some American Indian peoples have had other types of population concentrations. Their population concentrations or "cities," if you will, were not permanent, but temporary gatherings (for a few weeks or months) of smaller bands, groups or families. An

example here would be the gathering together of the Plains Indians at certain times.

Even limiting the referent of urbanization to areas developed by non-Indians, one is still not talking about only a recent occurrence, though undoubtedly a contemporary one of but a few hundred years. American Indians have been located in and involved with some of the largest current cities in the United States since the virtual inception of these cities, e.g., Los Angeles (Cook, 1976:302). Furthermore, the definition of urbanization used by the U.S. Bureau of the Census is a quite broad one, and an urban area may and typically does include several small cities and towns.¹ It is in some of these small cities and towns that American Indians have lived for many, many decades. It is to some of these small cities and towns that American Indians have migrated in the past and still migrate. The urbanization of American Indians additionally includes the differential non-migratory population growth of American Indians in urban versus rural areas. There are two ways populations grow and decline: one is through differences in births and deaths; the other is through migration. The urbanization of American Indians is a phenomenon of differential fertility and morality experience of Indian peoples in urban and rural areas and differential migrations to urban and rural areas. Finally, urbanization also involves the physical and social and cultural movement of "urbanism" to American Indians.

Cities have grown around and to areas of American Indian settlement and have urbanized physically Indian peoples without any movement on their part. Urbanism as a social and cultural event has been transmitted to Indian peoples in non-urban areas through television, radio, printed matter and other means of mass communication. Thus in certain senses American Indians have become "urbanized" in terms of values and norms without direct contact with urban areas.

The urbanization of American Indians does not typically refer to such a ~~multitude~~ of occurrences as all of these, however. As generally viewed, ~~American Indian~~ urbanization is primarily the (recent) movement of American Indians to the larger cities of the United States and Canada. This movement has certainly occurred and is still occurring. It is important to be aware, however, that American Indian urbanization encompasses much more than recent migrations of American Indians to a few dozen large European cities of the United States and Canada, as the land is now called.

I shall not be concerned here with the issue of pre-European urbanization of American Indians. The topic is beyond the intended scope of this conference, as I understand it. Thus I will not discuss the historic urban areas of American Indians or their development beyond the few words I have already mentioned. Let us just remember that "urbanization" is an American Indian development of the

Western Hemisphere as well as a non-Indian development of the Eastern Hemisphere.

I shall also not be concerned with the involvement of American Indians in the history of the current large cities of the United States and Canada. Nor shall I be concerned here with the topic of the general expansion of urbanism in normative and cognitive, social and cultural senses to American Indians in non-urban areas, though this has undoubtedly effected American Indians.

I will, however, attempt to maintain a somewhat broad, non-restrictive view of urbanization. This attempted view includes moderately sized cities and towns as well as the very large cities and urban areas. This attempted view also includes differential, non-migratory population growth between rural and urban areas as well as differential migration to them. I think a more complete and interesting as well as realistic view of the urbanization of American Indians over the past several decades and into the future may be obtained by attempting these views.

As agreed to with the organizers of the Conference, I shall attempt to describe the national scene of American Indian urbanization, as I have defined it. As more or less mandated by these organizers, I shall attempt to "stick to the data" and present some concrete descriptive facts about American Indian urbanization. I shall concentrate on demography of American Indian urbanization. I shall attempt

to discuss both some demographic patterns, i.e., the structure of American Indian populations, and demographic processes, i.e., the dynamics of American Indian populations, as American Indians have become urbanized in the senses used here. I think this demographic view is an important one and has insights to offer on the past, present and future of American Indians in cities and town. I shall, finally, limit my comments and observations to the United States and exclude Canada. This is due in part to the ways in which data are available and also in part to the fact that someone else is addressing the urbanization of American Indians in Canada.

The Trend Toward Urbanization

The largest increase in the urbanization of any group since 1930 in the United States has been in the urbanization of American Indians. In 1930, only 10% of American Indians lived in urban areas. By 1970, this figure had increased to 45%. Surely the 1980 Census enumeration will show well over 50% of American Indians living in urban areas. As indicated in Table 1, it is estimated that 50% of the American Indian population lived in urban areas in 1977. (Despite this increase in urbanization, American Indians--

(Table 1 about here.)

at least up until the 1970--were the most rural group of any in the United States Population. They were more than

twice as rural as the total population [Health, Education and Welfare, 1974:1].)

In the early 1950s and under the auspices of the Relocation Act of 1952, the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) began a program of urban relocation of American Indians. This program has not been responsible for all American Indian migration to urban areas and perhaps only about 100,000 people were directly moved under the program in its first twenty years (Margon, 1976:18-19). Not all of those relocated stayed in urban areas. (The return rate for relocatees has been estimated at between 30% and 70% [Margon, 1976:19].) However, this effort is certainly an important reason for this urbanization and has received considerable attention. An early report of this program is cited by Prucha (1975:237-38) and is from the 1954 Annual Report of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs:

. . . During the 1954 fiscal year, 2,163 Indians were directly assisted to relocate under the Bureau's relocation program. This included 1,649 persons in over 400 family groups, and 514 unattached men and women. In addition over 300 Indians left reservations without assistance to join relatives and friends who had been assisted to relocate. At their destination, Bureau Relocation Offices assisted this group also to adjust to the new community. The total number of relocations represented a substantial increase over relocations

during the previous fiscal year.

Of the 2,163 Indians assisted to relocate, financial assistance, to cover all or part of the costs of transportation to the place of relocation and short-term temporary subsistence were provided to 1,637 Indians, in addition to relocation services. This number included 1,329 persons in over 300 family groups, and 308 unattached men and women. An additional 526 Indians, including 320 in approximately 100 family groups and 206 unattached men and women, were assisted to relocate without financial assistance, but were provided relocation services only. These services included counseling and guidance prior to relocation, and assistance in establishing residence and securing permanent employment in the new community. . . .

Approximately 54 percent of the Indians assisted to relocate came from 3 northern areas (Aberdeen, Billings, and Minneapolis), and 46 percent came from 4 southern areas (Andarka, Gallup, Muskogee, and Phoenix). They went to 20 different States. The Los Angeles and Chicago metropolitan areas continued to be the chief centers of relocation.

Although the Relocation Act of 1952 may not have been the major reason for recent increases in American Indian urbanization, as indicated in Table 1 increases in urbanization of American Indians were modest until 1950.

Urbanization has increased considerably since then, particularly between 1950 and 1960 and between 1960 and 1970. Increases from 1970 to 1977 are less dramatic, it would seem.

As a conclusion to this section, it should be noted that American Indian peoples probably "migrate" (perhaps "travel" is a better term) to urban areas on a temporary basis to a much larger extent than non-Indian peoples. In other words, there seems to be a pattern of circular migration whereby periods of time are ~~spent~~ in urban areas and then a return to a reservation or ~~non-urban area is made~~ and then a ~~movement back to an urban area is made~~ once again. (See, for example, Blumenfield, 1965; Tax, 1978:128.)

Some Demographic Patterns and Processes

Given the trend toward urbanization, it has not been an even one, neither from region to region, nor from state to state, nor from city to city.

A movement toward the West may be seen in examining states in which American Indians lived other than those in which they were born.

In 1970, more than one-fifth (22%) of all Indians lived in states other than those in which they were born. The greatest migration across state lines has occurred within and into the West. 52% of all Indians who have

moved to another state now reside in the West. Of those moving to a western state, a quarter came from the South and 55% came from other western states. Nearly a quarter (23%) of all Indians moving to another state have moved into California and of those who have moved to California 71% have settled in urban areas (Health, Education and Welfare, 1974:13).

In Table 2 is shown the size of the urban American Indian population by state and percentage of all American Indians in state in urban areas (for states with at least 10,000 American Indians). Differences from 1960 to 1970 are also shown. As indicated in the Table, in 1960 Oklahoma had the largest urban American Indian population, but California did in 1970, while Oklahoma ranked second. However, the state with the largest percentage of its American Indian population living in urban areas in 1960 as well as 1970 was neither Oklahoma nor California, but Illinois, followed by Texas. Also, the state with the largest 1960 to 1970 increase was neither of these mentioned states, but North Carolina. The number of American Indians living in urban areas of North Carolina increased by 74% during the 1960s.

(Table 2 about here.)

Data are reported in Table 3 on the size of the American Indian population of selected United States cities. (They show the trend also from Oklahoma to California, from East to West.)

(Table 3 about here.)

In 1960, Oklahoma City had the largest American Indian population, followed by Los Angeles (and Long Beach); but, in 1970, Los Angeles (and Long Beach) had the largest American Indian population, followed by Oklahoma City.² Los Angeles (and Long Beach) also had the largest percentage increase during this period (479%), followed by two other California urban areas: San Diego (454%) and San Francisco-Oakland (439%).

There are important demographic differences between the American Indians living in these urban areas and those located in rural and reservation areas. Some of these differences may have serious implications for the future of the American Indian people as a physical population.

Urban adult American Indians tend to be younger than rural adult American Indians. For example, in 1970, almost a third of all adult urban Indians (35% of the men, 32% of the women) were still in their twenties, Less than a quarter of the adult rural Indians (24% of the men, 23% of the women) were this young, however.³

Despite this age difference, an important occurrence with urbanization is the lowering of the birth rate for American Indians. In 1971, the birth rate for American Indians was almost twice that of the total United States population--33.0 per 1,000 persons compared to 17.5 per 1,000. (This was down from 41.7 per 1,000 in 1960.)

(See Health, Education and Welfare [1974:18] for a discussion of these differences.) As urbanization continues, we can expect the birth rate for American Indians to decrease even further, as there are typically sharp urban-rural differences in birth rates. For example, Table 4 shows urban-rural differences in number of children per 1,000 American Indian women ever married. In each age group, urban women have proportionally fewer children than rural women.

(Table 4 about here.)

Another important occurrence with American Indian urbanization has been intermarriage with non-Indians. Overall, the intermarriage rate of American Indians with non-Indians is over one-third. In 1970, in rural areas, however, only 20% of married Indian men and 23% of married Indian women had a non-Indian spouse; but in urban areas, 51% of all married men and 55% of all married women had a non-Indian spouse.⁴

These trends may have importance for the future size of the American Indian population. Since 1890, when a nadir population of only slightly above two hundred thousand was reached, the American Indian population has experienced rapid total growth (Thornton & Thornton, in press). This has been despite the considerably shorter life expectancy of American Indians as compared with the total U.S. population. (In 1970, the life expectancy for American Indians was 63-64 years of age as compared to 71 years of age for

the white population [Health Education and Welfare, 1974: v].) This growth has continued to today, when the 1980 Census undoubtedly enumerated well over 1,000,000 American Indians. We cannot expect this to continue, however, given these demographic trends of increased urbanization and accompanying decreased fertility and increased intermarriage in urban areas.

The Issue of Tribalism

The trend toward urbanization of American Indians may also have implications for the survival of tribalism. Table 5 shows percent (in the 1970 Census) of American Indians not listing a tribal affiliation. Nationally, some 21% did not give a tribal affiliation; however, over 29% of American Indians living in urban areas did not report a tribal affiliation. This does not necessarily mean that

(Table 5 about here.)

tribalism is less strong in urban areas--though I suspect it is--only that tribalism is less pervasive. The implications of these data seem to be that urbanization is presenting new challenges to American Indians to maintain themselves as tribal (and also cultural) people, just as the reservation system and rural relocation presented challenges in the past. These challenges can certainly be overcome, as those of the past have been. Tribalism in urban areas may become (and, I think, has become) different from in the

past and/or in rural and reservation areas. It will, however, continue to exist in urban areas.

Conclusions

The increased involvement of American Indians in and with urban areas is thus bringing new challenges to American Indians as demographic people and as tribal people. These challenges are not, however, insurmountable ones. Looking at the history of the American Indian population and American Indian tribalism in what is now the United States (and Canada), increases the optimism that these dangers will be overcome. Similar threats have been overcome in the past. Any people who were decimated over a period of several hundred years from a population size of several million to a few hundred thousand and then recovered to a million in less than one hundred years is strong, demographically. Any people who were able to retain their tribalism during this physical devastation and the social and cultural devastation coinciding with it and today still have several hundred viable tribes is extremely strong, tribally.

FOOTNOTES

1. The definition for "urban" used in the 1970 Census (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1973:Appendix B) is:

The urban population comprises all persons living in urban areas. More specifically, the urban population consists of all persons living in (a) places of 2,500 inhabitants or more incorporated as cities, villages, boroughs (except Alaska), and towns (except in the New England States, New York, and Wisconsin), but excluding those persons living in the rural portions of extended cities; (b) unincorporated places of 2,500 inhabitants or more; and (c) other territory, incorporated or unincorporated, included in urbanized areas. The population not classified as urban constitutes the rural population.

An urbanized area, generally, consists of at least one city of 50,000 inhabitants or more in 1970 and the surrounding closely settled area that meets certain criteria of population density or land use. An urbanized area may be subdivided into the central city or cities, and the remainder of the area as "urban fringe." The central city portion, generally, consists of the population of the city or cities named in the title of the urbanized area.

2. It is also important to mention that American Indians are not necessarily distributed throughout these urban areas. They ". . . tend to live in white, Spanish and Asian central city, poverty and working class neighborhoods and in the rural fringes of major SMSA's" (Health, Education and Welfare, 1974:i). Sometimes they like other ethnic and social groups tend to be concentrated in certain areas of the city, e.g., the well-known Franklin Avenue area of Minneapolis. In many instances as well there are tribal concentrations within the American Indian population of cities, e.g., the different residential patterns found between the Ojibwa, Dakota (and Winnebago) of the Minneapolis-St. Paul area. Often this concentration is a result of certain "unplanned" processes of movement into the city. Other times, however, specific housing projects are created for American Indian populations. Also, this pattern is likely found in the smaller cities and towns as well as in the larger urban areas.

3. However, 11% of all adult rural American Indians are over 65 years of age, but only 7% of all adult urban American Indians are of this grouping.

4. Panunzio (1942:698-99) finds that the inter-marriage rate of Indians in Los Angeles from 1924-33 was 569 per 1,000 while the intramarriage rate was 431 per 1,000.

REFERENCES

Blumenfield, Ruth

- 1965 "Mohawks: round trip to the high steel,"
Transaction 3:19-22.

Cook, S. F.

- 1976 The Conflict Between the California Indian and
White Civilization. Berkeley, Calif.: University
of California Press.

Davis, Kingsley

- 1955 "The origin and growth of urbanization in the
world." American Journal of Sociology 60.

Health, Education and Welfare

- 1974 A study of Selected Socio-Economic Characteristics
of Ethnic Minorities Based on the 1970 Census,
Volume III: American Indians. Arlington, Va.:
Urban Associates, Inc.

Margon, Arthur

- 1976 "Indians and immigrants: a comparison of groups
new to the city," The Journal of Ethnic Studies,
4:17-28.

Panunzio, Constantine

- 1942 "Intermarriage in Los Angeles, 1924-33," American
Journal of Sociology, 47:690-701.

Prucha, Francis Paul (ed.)

1975 Documents of United States Indian Policy, Lincoln,
Neb.: University of Nebraska Press.

Sjoberg, Gideon

1960 The Pre-Industrial City. New York: The Free
Press.

Sorkin, Alan

1978 The Urban American Indian. Lexington, Mass.:
D. C. Heath and Co.

Tax, Sol

1978 "The impact of urbanization on American Indians."
The Annals of the American Academy of Political
and Social Science, 436:121-36.

Thornton, Russell and Joan Marsh-Thornton

in "Estimating prehistoric American Indian population
press size for United States area: implications of the
nineteenth century population decline and nadir."
American Journal of Physical Anthropology.

U.S. Bureau of the Census

1973 1970 Census of Population. Subject Reports:
American Indians. PC (2) - 1f. Washington, D.C.:
U.S. Government Printing Office.

TABLE 1.--Total, Urban and Rural American Indian Population
in the United States (to Nearest Thousand), 1890-1977

Year	Total	Urban	Rural	Percentage Urban
1890	248,000	--	--	--
1900	237,000	1,000	236,000	0.4
1910	266,000	12,000	254,000	4.5
1920	244,000	15,000	229,000	6.1
1930	332,000	33,000	299,000	9.9
1940	334,000	24,000	310,000	7.2
1950	343,000	56,000	287,000	13.4
1960	524,000	146,000	378,000	27.9
1970	764,000	340,000	424,000	44.5
1977 ^a	1,000,000	500,000	500,000	50.0

Source: Sorkin (1978:10).

TABLE 3.--Size of American Indian Population of Selected United States Cities, 1960, 1970 and 1976

City	1960 Population	1970 Population	Percentage Increase 1960-1970	1976 ^a Population
Oklahoma City	4,355	12,951	197	----
Los Angeles- Long Beach	4,130	23,908	479	40,000-75,000
Chicago	3,394	8,203	141	20,000
Minneapolis	2,007	9,911	377	14,000
Buffalo	1,931	5,606	190	----
Albuquerque	1,848	5,822	215	18,000
Seattle	1,729	8,814	409	17,000
San Francisco- Oakland	2,234	12,041	439	45,000-55,000
Dallas	1,466	5,500	275	10,000-12,000
New York	3,262	9,984	261	----
San Diego	1,083	6,007	454	----
Denver	1,133	4,104	278	10,000

Source: Sorkin (1978:11).

TABLE 4.--Children per 1,000 Women Ever Married, by Urban
Rural Nonfarm, Rural Farm Residence

	Urban	Rural Nonfarm	Rural Farm
Women, 15 to 24 years old	1,249	1,533	1,556
Women, 25 to 34 years old	2,890	3,645	3,615
Women, 35 to 44 years old	3,831	5,025	5,352

Source: 1970 Census Subject Reports, Table 3, p. 18.

TABLE 5.--Percent American Indians Not Reporting a Tribal Affiliation (in 1970 Census): Total, Urban and Reservation

Total, American Indian	21.2%
Urban, American Indian	29.1%
Reservation, American Indian	11.8%

Source: Tax (1978: Table 1); U.S. Bureau of the Census (1973: Table 16).

TABLE 2.--Urban American Indian Population for States (with over 10,000 American Indians), 1960 to 1970

State	1960		1970		% Increase
	Number	% of All Indians	Number	% of All Indians	
California	22,574	55.8	67,202	76.1	66.4
Oklahoma	23,257	37.0	47,623	49.2	51.2
New York	13,257	63.1	17,161	67.1	22.8
Arizona	8,662	10.4	16,442	17.4	47.3
Washington	11,882	55.9	16,102	52.2	26.2
Texas	4,643	69.8	14,567	86.1	68.1
New Mexico	9,023	16.1	13,405	18.7	32.7
Minnesota	4,994	31.6	11,703	52.4	57.3
Michigan	5,064	51.2	10,541	65.8	52.0
Illinois	5,895	91.5	9,542	92.6	38.2
South Dakota	4,615	17.9	9,115	24.4	49.4
Wisconsin	4,062	21.2	7,439	39.6	45.4
Oregon	2,662	32.3	6,976	52.8	61.8
North Carolina	16,6	4.2	6,194	14.0	74.0
Montana	2,804	14.0	5,070	19.2	44.7
Alaska	3,745	25.3	4,696	29.2	20.3
Utah	1,990	28.6	3,689	35.0	46.1
North Dakota	1,193	10.3	1,810	13.3	34.1

Source: Tax (1978:131).

RESPONSE TO RUSSELL THORNTON'S "PATTERNS AND
PROCESSES OF AMERICAN INDIANS IN
CITIES AND TOWNS"

by

~~Charlotte~~ ~~Heth~~

Experiences

I would imagine that I share the experience with other Indians attending this conference in trying to relate Dr. Thornton's remarks to events in my own family and to my personal experiences. As an Oklahoma Cherokee, I am aware that our vast land holdings in the Southeast were ceded to the United States by treaty in 1835, and that we were forced to emigrate to a ~~smaller tract of land~~ in Indian Territory (now the state of Oklahoma) ~~along the infamous "Trail of Tears."~~ Although ~~this federal policy killed one-third of~~ the Cherokee population, the people were ~~still~~ more crowded in their new homeland than they had ever been before.

The ever-shrinking boundaries of Indian nations in the United States in a continuum from large land holdings to reservations to allotments tended to increase the population density among Indians in general. Coupled with the higher birth rate cited by Dr. Thornton, the situation became acute. An allotment of 160 acres in 1907 when Oklahoma became a state might have been able to support a family of ten, but a generation later, it could not support an extended family of twenty-two, even with the cooperation of nearby relatives who also had large families. And, the allotted land for most families was not fertile enough for subsistence farming.

Dr. Thornton points toward an increase in urbanization among Indians since 1930, exactly a generation after the implementation of the Allotment Act. This is no coincidence. Younger Indian people in the 1930s, often still in their teens, moved to the smaller cities and towns near their homes to get work as unskilled laborers and domestics in order to support themselves and to send money home to help their families. Frequently these moves were seen as temporary with their making trips home as often as possible. Often the younger person stayed with an older, married brother or sister in town until his or her "temporary" status had become permanent or until he had returned home.

In my own family, my grandfather moved his family a few miles from his allotment to a very small town where his father lived, and finally to Sallisaw, the largest town in the county. He was a handyman, gardener, butcher, barber, and cook. In town he could use these skills to support his large family. Out in the country, he could not.

My mother, when she reached sixteen in 1930, moved to the nearest larger town, Muskogee, to go to work to support herself and to help my grandparents buy a house. After my parents were married and I was two years old, we moved to Tulsa, the nearest larger town, for my father to get a better job. Finally, as might be predicted, my parents moved to Los Angeles in 1964 to find work, only to return to Oklahoma as soon as they could retire in 1978.

I do not view my own family as archetypal, but the statistics and trends in Dr. Thornton's paper just happen to fit the steps taken by my family, with one exception. We did not experience the rigors of Relocation, but chose self-reliance after a few rebuffs by the BIA in the late 1930s.

Anticipating the trend towards Indian migration to California, some recently urbanized Oklahoma Indians started the Los Angeles Indian Center as a drop-in center and social club in 1934. Throughout its history the Indian Center has grown and changed to suit the needs of Los Angeles' growing Indian population and most recently to respond to guidelines of federal funding agencies. In addition to the Indian Center and neighborhood centers, Long Beach, Los Angeles, and Orange County have two Indian health clinics, four alcohol rehabilitation programs, a drug rehabilitation program, four powwow clubs, numerous Indian churches, a program for the elderly, a pre-school, and a Los Angeles City-County Indian Commission that meets monthly.

Despite the factionalism that arises in any inter-tribal (or even tribal) setting, a Los Angeles--Long Beach --Orange County Indian network exists, for better or worse, to serve urban Indian people. A resident of Los Angeles County can visit a neighborhood Indian center almost any day or night of the week and can attend a powwow club meeting or dance every Saturday night, Indian softball and basket-

ball leagues bring people together while Indian bars and night clubs also serve a portion of the population. An annual picnic is held for the entire Los Angeles Indian population.

Every state college and university in the area has an Indian program of some sort, and many Indian college students serve on advisory boards for the various centers.

Problems and Prospects

This critical mass of Indians in Los Angeles is presenting new problems and is concomitantly devising new strategies to deal with these problems. In the cities now, such as Los Angeles, but also in Minneapolis-St. Paul, Chicago, San Francisco-Oakland and Seattle, we are meeting a new generation of Indian people. These are the children of the city and of Relocation. They do not go home every weekend to the Indian communities from whence they came, because they are too far away, and these young people were born in the cities. A yearly pilgrimage to visit relatives or to attend a "homecoming" or powwow may be their only contact with ancestral or reservation homelands.

There is a yearning among this disenfranchised, but economically better off, generation for a true Indian identity. These young Indians are subjected to all the racial jokes about rain: too much rain means they are dancing too much; too little rain means they are dancing too little.

They sometimes join clubs or otherwise associate with other brown people, mostly Chicanos, but do not speak Spanish. They are stereotyped by movies and television and are surprised that the majority population and authority figures do not recognize differences among Indian cultures and languages. How do you say "horse" or "I love you" in "Indian" are frequent reference questions at the UCLA Indian studies center.

Because of the larger society's expectations of Indians, we find these young people seeking an Indian identity that may turn out to be Pan-Indian in the city. If wearing beads, feathers, and turquoise could make Indians out of people, then the French Riviera would be full of Indians this season with the new wave of Indian-inspired fashions. All kidding aside, these youngsters need to learn (1) about themselves, (2) the truth about their ancestors, and (3) to understand and respect their cultural heritage. If they want to wear headbands and learn to sing and dance in Southern or Northern Plains style afterwards, that is then a positive reinforcement and association made from personal choice, not outside pressure. For years I would not dance at powwows because Cherokees did not dance in that manner or wear plains costumes. Although I have overcome my discomfort, I am still reticent when dancing in someone else's style.

It is sometimes embarrassing to be an Indian in the

city. Besides the jokes mentioned above about the weather, we can be called "chief, "squaw," "brave," "buck," or even "papoose," by our coworkers. Is it any wonder then that a skilled Indian worker would prefer to work with other Indians at a lesser salary than to make more money working in a White corporate office or on a construction site?

Dr. Sol Tax points out in his article on the "Impact of Urbanization on American Indians" that "we cannot escape our own up-bringing" and goes on to say (and I paraphrase) that people brought up in a social system where giving brings more honor than ownership must find difficulty in facing the impersonal, materialist, competitive society of the city (Tax 1978:124-25). Family and reciprocal kinship relations may have had pleasant rewards in a rural, agricultural environment, but in the city with its materialism and difficulty in "making ends meet," extended-family obligations often become burdensome to a newly-employed individual causing him or her unforeseen and unintentional economic hardships. Even the Indian student in the university may be earning more on financial aid than his nuclear family at home and may be expected to help out. What is seen as "big money" in a rural or reservation area may only pay the rent in the city.

I discovered that I was an urban Indian in 1976 in Tahlequah, Oklahoma, when I attended a symposium on the American Indian Policy Review Commission. A Kiowa woman

stood up on the floor and asked Ernie Stevens what they were going to do about the "urban Indians." Realizing that Tulsa was my home town and that she was talking of the kinds of problems my family had faced, was an awakening for me. I was subsequently elected to the Advisory Board of the Indian Centers, Inc. in Los Angeles, and this confirmed my suspicion that I might be an urban Indian. Because I had always been taken back to rural family enclaves, or had taken myself back when I was old enough, I had not thought of myself as urban. Also I had always thought of myself as temporarily in Los Angeles, or temporarily at UCLA, even though I had been in the city for longer than a decade.

The new generation of Indians born in the cities will face different challenges and choices from the ones my generation faced. They will be confronted with questions they cannot answer about Indian life, past or present; they will seek answers to these questions, or they will ignore them; they will strive to learn their languages and customs, or they will forget all about them; some will "learn" to be Sioux or Kiowa when they might really be Creek or Yakima; they will participate in and run the Indian organizations in the cities to serve their constituencies' needs; they will marry other Indians, Whites, Chicanos, Asians, and Blacks; they will go "home" or they will become alienated; they will retain tribal values or they will "sell out."

Whatever the 1980s and 1990s bring to Indian people in the cities in terms of population, income, and education, I would like to issue a watchword to all. Stay with your family; stay with your tribe; stay with your people.

References

Tax, Sol

- 1978 "The impact of urbanization on American Indians."
The Annals of the American Academy of Political
and Social Science, 436:121-36.

Thornton, Russell

- 1980 "Patterns and processes of American Indians in
cities and towns."

INDIANS IN CHICAGO

by

Merwyn S. Garbarino

Preface

This paper is in a way out of date--or at least a decade late, for I have done no research in Chicago since the end of 1970. I do not pretend to know what the situation is today for Chicago's Indian residents, though I might hazard a guess or two in some spheres of activity. Therefore I am eagerly anticipating the comments of Mrs. White Horse, which will follow mine and bring the presentation into the present.

Recent History

A small population of American Indians, primarily from Great Lakes and northern plains tribes, resided in Chicago in the 1930s. During most of that decade the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) maintained a supply depot in the city to provision agencies located in the midwest, and it provided employment for a small number of Indians in Chicago. The population was so small and its visibility so low at that time that many people, Indian and non-Indian alike, are astonished to learn of its existence. The following decade saw a more visible and sizable Indian population responding to two new conditions of national life: war industries and membership in the armed services.

Expectably, during these two decades, some Indian residents of Chicago came to consider the city home, became permanent dwellers, and raised families here. Though no

ward or district of Chicago contained a majority of Indian population, there were three areas where Indians tended to concentrate: Near Garfield Park and West Madison; around Lake Park and 47th Street; and around Fullerton and Diversey. Numbers remained small, but contacts with urban life had been established, visitors from reservations carried back information about the city, and avenues for introducing others from back home to conditions and resources of city living expanded. By the '50s, a second generation of city dwellers met at social gatherings, spread information about employment, and extended psychological support in an informal way. In addition to informal meetings and occasions, city Indians sponsored major functions from time to time, attracting a larger assemblage in a rented auditorium or ballroom. Individuals were responsible for arranging these events and notifying others, for in the '30s and '40s no formal Indian organization was active.

During those early decades the exact number of city-dwelling Indians are in question. The 1940 census count of 274 is disputed as too low by those who lived here at that time. Certainly the population was very mobile during the war years, not only with servicemen temporarily in the city, but also much movement back and forth to reservations and rural towns, newcomers often joining existing households, both in response to traditional kinship ties, and because

of the grave housing shortage of wartime. Certainly this mobility made census accuracy impossible.

During the later years of the 1940s, ex-servicemen came back to the city seeking jobs and increasingly the city attracted others from towns and reservations who perceived a brighter employment future in the metropolitan area. Information about city life and conditions had become rather widespread after the war years, and many if not most of those who came on their own had realistic expectations of urban living.

A realistic outlook was not so common among the next wave of Indians, those arriving in the '50s as the result of the BIA relocation program, for among these people expectations varied widely, depending in large measure upon the competence with which the local reservation BIA personnel carried out the preparation activities mandated by the program.

In 1952, the BIA opened a Chicago office to aid in relocation, and Indian movement to the city accelerated each ensuing month until hundreds were arriving. To facilitate adjustment to Chicago, the Bureau arranged for living accommodations as close to training centers and job locations as possible, but with increasing familiarity with the city, the new arrivals moved to quarters of their own choosing. By the late '50s, the major concentration of Indian people centered in the area known as Uptown, though even

there, Indian residents were not the majority ethnic group, Appalachian whites and later Puerto Ricans being more numerous. In addition, other areas of the city and many of the suburbs began to have Indian residents, people desiring to live close to employment or to own homes with more land.

Many new residents felt that services and counseling by the BIA left much to be desired, and attempts were made by Indians and non-Indians to organize some sort of club or association that would offer psychological support services and also social entertainment and recreation. Eventually, after several aborted attempts, the American Indian Center was founded and incorporated as a not-for-profit organization which expanded in membership, services rendered, and financial support until it was able to purchase a Masonic Temple at 1630 West Wilson. This site has become a central point to which many Indian city dwellers are drawn for various occasions and functions. While other locations and organizations supported Indian urbanization in important ways--St. Augustine's Indian Center and the Native American Committee for example--and though the American Indian Center had many trials and tribulations over finances and control, the Center became the principal focus of urban Indians. Examples of its activities and offerings include: a summer day camp and Headstart classes for the young, the program that became the Little Big Horn High School, and casework and family services to an estimated five thousand

people per year. Especially for those who have found adjustment to city living difficult or lonely, the Center has been a significant resource. The membership list for 1964/65 showed members of 79 different tribes participating in Center activities, a coverage of most of the United States and Canada.

The acquisition of the new building has allowed expansion of many activities and services because it contains many meeting rooms, large halls, and two fully equipped kitchens. Standing committees direct the expanding program, working with and through an executive director and a staff of full and part-time employees. Social activities, educational programs, and counseling services at the Center have been instrumental in easing loneliness and providing recreation for Indians in Chicago. It is difficult to quantify the importance of the Center, but my strong impression during the time I was engaged in research was that without the Center many Indians, especially those with economic and social problems, would have found adjustment to urban life vastly more difficult and the impact of the city demoralizing.

Problems in City Living

Problems confronting Indians in Chicago are not really different from those facing other ethnics moving to a city from rural background, though there are important differences between Indians moving to Chicago and foreign immigrants to the city. That difference might be briefly

sketched: Europeans, for example, are really cut off from their place of origin because it is too hard to get back, whereas Indians are not separated from the land of their birth, and ties to reservations are usually strong and they can and do return easily. Indians are Americans, while the others must become Americans, and that has implications for their behavior.

However, for the purpose of this conference, it is more pertinent to compare Indian adjustment with the adjustment of other American non-urban populations. Perhaps there is only a difference of degree, and even that is difficult to generalize about. For both groups economic difficulties focus on inadequate training since unskilled and semi-skilled people are more subject to frequent lay-offs and a more restricted job market. To the degree that education prior to coming to the city is substandard, access to compensation to support oneself and families will be limited.

Socially Indians, like other newcomers, may suffer loneliness or isolation. Organizations like Indian centers and clubs help ease these conditions by creating a micro-environment where individuals will feel less constrained because they are with those of similar backgrounds, needs, and expectations. I did not meet anyone who was so unfamiliar with the urban condition that such problems as transportation, shopping, medical aid, and the like were incapable of solution. Crowding, noise, pollution, and so

on were factors creating no more malcontent for Indians as a group than for others.

For some, especially older people, tribal membership is constantly in mind. Even younger people born in the city can tell their tribal descent. But it seems as though the longer in the city the less important it becomes. Most especially is this the case when each parent is from a different tribe so the children refer to themselves as, for example, Sioux-Potawatomi. One young man said, "I am Chippewa-Winnebago and my wife is Oneida-Mohawk. Will our kids call themselves Chippewa-Winnebago-Oneida-Mohawk?" This intermarriage situation which is increasing (like intermarriage with non-Indians) will surely emphasize a general Indian identity. Whether it will be of the "pow wow" tradition will, I suspect, depend upon the degree of education and the socioeconomic level. One Indian male commented, "I think a bunch of grown men jumping around a drum are just plain dumb." He is certainly not alone in that attitude though he also most certainly does not speak for all. Nevertheless, within recent time, loyalty to tribal affiliation is still strong, and associations of Indians from the same tribe are prominent at the Indian Center. Thus the Winnebago Club and Sioux Club have regular meeting times and often sponsor special events.

Activist Movements

Activist movements in the '60s in Chicago tended to generate great enthusiasm and then peter out with little recorded accomplishment. One which was not widely publicized by the media but which stimulated great hopes on the part of many dedicated Indians was the American Indians-United (AI-U). AI-U was organized in Seattle, Washington in 1968 to represent off-reservation Indian centers--an organization of organizations, in fact. Its first meeting was in the same year at the Chicago Indian Center which also became the central office. The purpose was to fill a need for formal means of interaction and communication among non-reservation Indians, coordinating educational, economic, social and other services and programs.

By early 1970, the organization was in serious difficulty. Severe contention, resulting from regional and probably tribal factionalism, began to disrupt meetings, and the organization began to evince considerable mistrust of the Executive Director who was believed to have misappropriated funds. Many people viewed the decline of AI-U sadly, for it was the only major attempt to organize non-reservation Indians on a nation-wide scale. Considering the size of the population it would have served, its demise was disheartening.

Though some interest in national organizations was manifest in Chicago during the '60s, few participated in

such groups as the American Indian Movement (AIM) or the National Indian Youth Council (NIYC). Two young men in their late teens joined the sit-in at Alcatraz, but I knew of no others. Many avidly read news articles about such activities, but also many made statements that activism on that order was not the Indian way. It is my impression that there was little grass roots support, that what active support existed came from younger people, often still in school, or from people without employment who had no structured demands on their time.

One movement attracted ~~tremendous~~ attention in Chicago although active participants amounted to no more than a few dozen. This movement was indigenously Chicagoan, starting out as a moderate--or perhaps not serious--protest of an eviction of an Indian family. The protesters set up a tipi for temporary shelter for the family. Within a short period, probably less than a week, while the news media made a great splurge during a period of slow news, some began to take advantage of journalistic attention to blow the original incident into a more encompassing protest. Funds and aid from outside groups resulted in the erection of more tipis and the development of an "Indian village." While the number and identity of participants varied, activities stemming from the original action in summer 1970 endured until sometime well into 1972.

Basically a reaction to housing problems, the Indian

village commanded impressive news coverage, and moved from its original encampment near Wrigley Field to an abandoned Nike site at Belmont Harbor, to the basement of a city church, to abandoned apartments on the northwest, to a forest preserve, to the Argonne National Laboratories, to a camp near Naperville. Finally the protesters claimed federal land at Fort Sheridan. During all this, one man was considered leader, or perhaps the news media created him leader, for they certainly strengthened his position by the many interviews wherein they referred to him as leader.

Many Indians who took no part were amused by these activities and looked upon the flouting of city and private authorities with no little glee. However, many more others thought it all shameful, especially stories of the filth and drinking at the various sites. Several people blamed the self-appointed leader and were quoted as calling him a fraud and a disgrace. Nevertheless, through all the disapproval ran a degree of gratification that Indians were at last "doing something."

Life in Chicago

In comparing over 50 studies I have done of Indians who live in Chicago to (far fewer) histories of non-Indians in the city, I have found little difference in the average reaction to urban life. Comments indicate overwhelmingly that both groups have found pleasure in some situations and

difficulties in others. Dirt, noise, crowding, violence, impersonality, are uniformly considered objectionable while employment conditions, entertainment, and variety are attractive. What then gives rise to the notion that city life is especially difficult for Indians--for there is a common tenet that this is true.

I suggest three explanations for this belief: (1) publicity for failures; (2) lack of political know-how; (3) lack of urban role models.

1. Infinitely more publicity has been given to the failures of urban life. Journalists have been tireless in their search for cases of Indians suffering temporary or long-term problems that can be considered urban. The result of this is that no one hears of the successful adaptation; it is not news.

2. Indians as a group have little or no political clout in cities, and so far they have been unable to generate organization and unity that produce political clout. Innumerable breakdowns have occurred historically, in cities and without, in attempts to unite Indians, and the problem of union has yet to be solved. In Chicago, demography precludes the use of political muscle, for Indians are not the dominant population in any ward, and their cultural traditions frequently mitigate against joining with other groups. They have had a long-term suspicion of blacks and Latinos, and in Uptown where Indian settlement is densest, they have

shown no inclination to unite with that other "left-out" group, the Appalachian whites.

In addition, Indians have had little experience with political decision making, coming from reservations where decision making is frequently the prerogative of the BIA, though lip service may be paid to Indian independence. BIA decision making has resulted in political passivity on many reservations, so Indians do not bring with them any tradition of small town government. Consequently we miss the political savvy like that shown by many other ethnic leaders and see instead protest mounted by a certain few who have had expectations of unrealistic results or a need for attention. The resultant publicity may be satisfying to individuals, but it does not result in ward organization and the ability to influence the vote. There is no sign of Indian awareness of a route to power through grassroot local politics. And, furthermore, when other groups have been successful in bettering their own conditions, I have discerned nothing to indicate that their methods have been appreciated by enough Indians to make a successful grab for power for themselves.

3. Other reasons for difficulties in adjusting to city life may derive from the fact that role models are lacking that are effectual for urban conditions. Family, that bastion of proper behavior, all too frequently cannot act as guide, since adults directly from rural areas may not

be equipped as role models for the more complex urban environment. Some, accustomed to relief checks, surrender job initiative to a life on welfare with an apathetic response of "What's the use?" Such passive resistance by parents to "whiteman's" standards of getting ahead will have impact on their children's views of the efficacy of the individual and success at school. With no model of financial security or success resulting from long training, the young tend to drop out of school at a high rate. In addition, the drop out rate is exacerbated by demographics again: Indian students are always not just a minority, but a small minority. That by itself may explain the popularity of Little Big Horn High School.

Often when we look at unadjusted children we find the mother lonely, isolated from kinfolk, usually not a high school graduate, and with no wage labor skills. The father may be competent in the traditional culture or for rural labor requirements, but in the city he is just another man in the populous unskilled labor pool, one who will probably demonstrate little job tenacity because he has no expectations of advancement. And he leaves his family, where he may well feel a failure, to spend his evenings in an all male group. Thus his sons miss out on a father's contributions to family life and encouragement for success. All of this applies equally to non-Indian groups.

Models of success outside the family may not be

available since successful Indians often leave Uptown and sever ties with the community. Those with better education do not go into Uptown to begin with, preferring to live elsewhere in the city or in the suburbs. It is difficult to know much about these people because they rarely grant interviews and are not recognized by the public as Indian or if recognized, it is more in the pattern of American citizens who are from an ethnic background like Lithuanian, Italian, etc., but whose public lifestyle and appearance fall well within the mode of the dominant, middle class society. Consequently, the publicized and recognized "urban Indian problems" pertain to only a part of the urban Indian population, and I judge, not a very large population. But for that group, there are many problems to be solved. Unfortunately, as for all urban poor, a common response to those problems is to hope that ignoring them will render them invisible.

Profiles of Three Successful Migrants

Lorette is a Chippewa from a reservation near Lake Superior. She had been a city resident for about 20 years when I met her in the late '60s. She was raised along with eight siblings by a widowed mother who was a cook in a lumber camp where her husband had been a logger. Her father was of French and Indian descent. During her childhood Lorette saw her mother follow many traditional ways especially useful in stretching finances for her rather large

family. She cured deer hides and rabbit skins for moccasins, jackets, and mittens, and also obtained secondhand clothing from white people in town and flour and feed bags to be sewn into dresses from farmers in the area. The children had a happy though financially restricted life, and Lorette remembered very exciting occasions like gathering wild rice and the dances and feasts that followed. She also remembered how very hard her mother worked.

The children were taught always to be generous with what they had, though their mother considered this an attribute of Christianity rather than a traditional Indian trait. However, the mother was famed as a curer, and her cures were definitely traditional and probably learned from the Medicine Society, the Midewiwin. Lorette confided that she believed her mother was a member of the society, though she never admitted it.

Upon her mother's death, Lorette, aged 14, left school to care for the younger children; the three older had married and left home. She worked as a waitress because she had no specific skills, but the jobs near the reservation were poor paying, so she moved with the children to a mid-sized city and from there to Chicago where the income from waiting on tables was sufficient, and there she saw the younger children finish school and marry. When I met her she had been widowed for several years, her husband, not Indian, described by her as very good and kind. His death

had been a severe shock, and she all the more valued her nephews and nieces who lived in Chicago and filled the roles of the children she had never had. All her relatives had remained in cities, all because of superior employment possibilities. None of them ever considered returning to rural life.

As wealth is usually counted, Lorette had lived an economically deprived childhood. Her impoverished mother had struggled to keep her family together, and Lorette had to work very hard herself ~~after her mother died~~. Nevertheless, Lorette never spoke of her past with ~~sorrow or regret~~ except when speaking of the untimely deaths of her parents whom she loved. She spoke rather with pride in her parents' accomplishments with the starting phrase "My mother (or father) always told us that . . ."--bits of advice on human behavior or observations of human frailty with admonishment for tolerance. The lessons learned stayed with her: work hard, take care of your own, and share what you have with others.

The move to a city was neither frightening nor unpleasant to her because it meant she could attain the goal of providing for her family and remaining near them as they matured. Those strong family ties remained strong even after her marriage. Inlaws were absorbed into the family and became integral members, and this closeness has continued to the third generation of grand-nephews and nieces

who are told the tales of grandparents and great-grandparents so that those ancestors became very real to the children. Although Lorette spoke of the rural area of the reservation as beautiful, it is but a memory, for her home is where her siblings and their descendants live.

Constanza, my second example, came from the southwest, a full blood Indian woman. Her life had been hard and her memories sad. Her father had killed her mother in a drunken rage when Constanza was very young and had been convicted of murder and jailed. She remembered him with great fear although he had been dead for many years when I met her.

As an infant, she was taken by an aunt who felt obligated as her father's older sister. The child recalled no love in that arrangement, only a grudging acceptance of kin responsibility which was allotted to the motherless child. Constanza received no tenderness or concern throughout her childhood and adolescence, and in fact, was the object of neglect and abuse, for like her father her aunt was a heavy drinker, and Constanza put much of the blame for her childhood woes on drinking.

Without much family encouragement, Constanza entered an Indian boarding school because she realized the need for education. Upon graduation from high school, she decided that her best course of action lay in taking advantage of more training through the BIA relocation program.

During training she met many Indian girls from many tribes while taking courses, but she was fearful of making friends because she felt unwanted and worthless and said she did not want to be hurt any more. However, her mind was on succeeding in her studies because while she had only a nebulous plan for the future, past experience had taught her that education was one way of attaining recognition to compensate for the lack of affection in her life.

Life in Chicago where she was in school was not hard, especially compared to the life she had lived. She had always been a loner, so the anonymity of the city was perfectly agreeable to her, and she had a bit of income and was pleased to be learning how to manage her finances. A short time after graduation she met a man who paid her a lot of attention and showed her the small considerations that had never been her lot in life. It seemed that a beautiful thing had happened to her. Then almost simultaneously she learned two things: he was married and she was pregnant. The armor she had built as emotional defense stood her in good stead. Where a breakdown might have been expectable, she mentally shrugged her shoulders and thought that once again life demonstrated that she should never trust anyone. She made arrangements through an agency for delivery and then to have the baby adopted. However she found she could not give up the baby because, as she put it,

"I wanted something to love, something that nobody could take away from me."

The baby girl was two years old when I met Constanza where they were living in one of the black neighborhoods of Chicago, a neighborhood of mixed private family homes and well tended apartments. During the day while she worked, a black woman friend took care of the baby. Constanza was puzzled by the common prejudice of Indians against blacks. The father of her baby was black, and she found them as a group more relaxed and friendly than whites whom she remembered from reservation days as unpredictable and untrustworthy. However, her residence in a black neighborhood isolated her from other Indians geographically and socially. Most of the Indians she knew disapproved of her association with blacks and often made unkind remarks.

Unlike Lorette, Constanza did not like to speak of her childhood and when she did it was in sorrow, often in tears. Her refrain was to the effect that she had learned to be strong, to live on her own, and to trust no one. When Lorette spoke, her face sparkled with vivacity; Constanza's speech mannerisms were those of a dummy, only her mouth and occasionally her eyes moved. Only rarely did she smile or frown, and her hands and body were still, her arms close to her side and motionless. She gave the impression of always thinking carefully before speaking; there was no spontaneity. Her business school education and prior academic experience

strengthened her sense of responsibility and obligation, and her ethic was hard work, responsibility and individualism in distinct contrast to Lorette's philosophy of communalism, sharing and mutual help. Neither found adjustment to urban life hard; Lorette because she had her family, Constanza because she expected nothing from anyone and would have been no more disappointed or disturbed in a city than anywhere else. All the world would be equally unloving to her.

My third example of successful adaptation is a man who was born on a northern ~~plains~~ reservation and grew up in a small city where his ~~parents worked close to the reser-~~vation. His parents were Cree and Sioux. He went ~~through~~ the public school system doing extremely well academically, and upon graduation was awarded a scholarship to an eastern university where he studied medicine. He chose Cook County Hospital for his internship because it gave him access to a far more extensive range of medical problems than most other hospitals. He did not at any time indicate to me that his work at Cook County or his eventual residence in the Chicago suburbs had any relationship to the Indian population here. I would describe his adjustment to urban conditions so complete as to be assimilation. His expressed sentiments are, "I look upon my background in the same way I imagine someone might view Irish or French descent. I am one of the general American population, and I know who my ancestors were all right, but it does not enter into my day

to day existence." He never attends Indian assemblages or entertainment at the Center, and the Chicago Indians he knows he describes as acquaintances, not friends.

I met the doctor quite by chance through a friend from his school years. His practice is suburban, and to all appearances his life differs not at all from his neighbors. Since both parents are dead, he has maintained no ties with the reservation where he was born. He once drove his wife and children through the state and area of his birth, and he said the children were interested in his childhood, but that his youth was not really different from others in his school. He was amused to note that his children have told their friends that he is an Indian, but he is sure that it is less important to them than the fact that he is a doctor. Almost all his life, his commitment has been to medicine, and I consider him thoroughly upper middle class in values and activities.

The doctor is a product of ability and parental encouragement. His parents backed his goals in medicine and his endeavors were of the caliber to attract a university scholarship. He had realistic expectations of what it would take to achieve his goals, and achievement orientation and delayed gratification were values inculcated in his childhood. He was an almost certain success provided his individual psychological strength could withstand the pressures and tensions of obtaining a medical degree and establishing

a practice. Probably because he had spent little time on the reservation, he felt no pull to return, and since service to Indians was never his goal, it is not surprising that he has become a thorough suburbanite.

In my first two examples we saw two very different women with different backgrounds and different personalities who came to the same city and made their homes there. Neither one indicated that the city per se was a difficult environment. Neither one has sought to leave the city. A tentative suggestion might be made that too much emphasis has been placed on city environment to the exclusion of other variables. This appears to be true especially in some of the more flamboyant newspaper accounts of the city as a "cement prairie" to which Indians cannot adapt.

Success in the City

There are two ways of reckoning success: success in the estimation of outsiders, and success in one's own terms. For the purposes of this paper I have meant personal success. If an individual considers his life in the city successful and prefers for whatever reason to continue living under urban conditions, I will not quarrel with his judgment. Therefore I am not trying to delineate universal conditions of successful adjustment--whoever feels successful--but I have come to some conclusions about the factors contributing to successful adaptation to the city.

It seems to me that there are five components to success, some social and some individual and psychological. I will not list them in order of importance because I think they are all important, and for different people and different conditions, these factors would have to be differently weighted.

1. The will to succeed, to do what is necessary to achieve one's goals (understanding cause and effect).
2. The ability to appraise the urban situation realistically.
3. The ability to plan and to wait for the future (future orientation).
4. Viewing the city as a positive environment.

THE INDIANS OF CHICAGO
A PERSPECTIVE

By

Chauncina White Horse

My remarks will be brief and to the point, they will be from my own perspective, a perspective that has been formed from living in Urban areas since 1930. In most Urban areas and especially here in Chicago there is now an elderly Urban Indian population that has survived the early years of struggle to build a transitional life between the reservation and the city. Nearly all elderly Indians grew up on their reservations. Most were born after the beginning of the twentieth century--after Indian people had been put on reservations. The elderly Indians were born of a beaten and decimated people, they were seen by whites as being the "vanishing Americans" soon to disappear from the face of the earth as a distinct people. But this generation did not disappear--they multiplied. They were unskilled by white standards, often unemployed and almost always poor. They made a home in the city, marrying, raising families and always visiting "back home" keeping the tribal identities and teaching the children to be proud of being Indian. Our Elderly Urban Indians are the transitional people, standing with one foot in the tribal ways and one foot in the dominant white world. These survivors of the era before relocation and federal programs are the people who can relate the history of the changes and formation of the American Indian in Chicago or other Urban areas. Histori-

cally the elderly were venerated and regarded as sources of wisdom and guidance in their community, but now whenever any research is to be done regarding the history of the American Indian, for instance the Urban Indian of Chicago, the area we are discussing here today, the grant will usually go to a non-Indian, at one point here in Chicago we had data obtained by the person infiltrating Indian organizations under false pretenses. I would like to see research documented by older Indians who can give the Indian perspective on the information obtained from the Indian Elders who lived in those early years and are still observing the changes. Most of the Indian elderly did not have an opportunity of being able to attend college and receive a degree but the experiences of their life time would qualify them as the historians of some of the greatest changes regarding the American Indian coming into the cities and looking for a better life.

World War II was responsible for many Indians coming to the cities because of the acute economic problems on their reservations. The next wave of Indian immigration to the cities began with the BIA Relocation Program in 1952, this was when the BIA began a policy of relocating reservation Indians and Alaskan Natives into the urban areas with promises of a better life. In Chicago, Indians moved into sub-standard housing in the areas of the near south and near north from the loop. Some came for vocational training,

some for direct employment. Ineffectual job training, non-existent support services in many areas, the low support income hurt many families. The inevitable cultural shock of an urban environment also increased the frustration and confusion. The relocation office here in Chicago had 29 people on staff in the '60s. By 1972 the number of Indians coming on relocation was greatly reduced and most came for vocational training. This office now has a staff of 3 people and will be closed permanently on September 30, 1980. Tribal arrangements will have to be made with the schools for vocational training in the future. Many Indians coming into Chicago in the '50s and '60s were not able to adjust to the urban life of aggressiveness and competition. Materialism was never important to the Indian up to this time, so that many did return home. However, we have many who met the challenges confronting them and have raised their families here, some eventually settling in the suburbs, their children are now better educated and in new professions.

At this time I would like to tell you about some of the Indians who are "Relocation" successes and some who came on their own. There are so many outstanding Indian people in the Chicago Indian community it was hard to select the few that time will permit me to tell you about. I am very much aware of the many other successful urban Indians.

Marvin Tahmahkera

Marvin Tahmahkera is from the Comanche tribe (4/4 Blood) and in 1965 he left his home in Walters, Oklahoma to come to Chicago on the Relocation Program to seek employment. In an article to be published soon, Marvin says, "The culture shock experienced by my Grandparents and Parents has had a definite affect on myself and other Native Americans entering the mainstream of the dominant society. Changes are slow and often difficult to make." Marvin met his wife Glenda, a Menominee, here and they now reside in the suburban area, with their two children. Marvin was successful and had constant employment in steel tool sales and management. It was with this background that he was able to create Comanche Steel Co. Comanche Steel Co. opened its doors for business on November 1, 1979 in Forest Park, Illinois, after successfully securing a loan from the Sears Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago with a 90% guarantee by the Small Business Administration. Comanche Steel Co. is owned equally by three partners and qualifies as a Minority owned business.

Marvin Tahmahkera is the President, Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive officer. His personal friend, Donald L. Howard (Mandan/Sioux Tribe) from Newton, North Dakota and a registered member of the Fort Berthold Indian Agency, came to Chicago on the Relocation Program in 1970 and with nine years experience in steel warehouse management

is now Vice-President and Steel Management Officer.

The third partner is Joseph S. McKinsey (Scotchman) Vice-President and Steel Management Procurement Officer.

Willard LaMere

When I stated that Comanche Steel received a guarantee for their loan from the Small Business Association it is important that I tell you about Willard LaMere who was the Executive Director of the American Indian Business Association of Chicago and the Midwest from June of 1975 to July 1977. It was Willard La Mere who was instrumental and did the groundwork for creating Comanche Steel. Due to lack of statistics the funding was cut off in 1977 for AIBA, very unfortunate as a few more years would have shown results like Comanche and helped other Indians in the area to create their own businesses. Willard LeMere has been a resident of the Chicago Indian Community for well over forty years and one of the leaders of the community. For approximately twenty-five years he was in the restaurant management business serving as coordinating manager in an eight state area. He has also owned and operated his own restaurant in Chicago. He is from the Winnebago tribe, and at this time is the Executive Director of the American Indian Center, also the President of the Indian Council Fire one of the oldest organizations concerned with Indians in the city of Chicago. It was founded in 1923 and at the Chicago Century of

Progress in 1933 the Indian Fire Council founded its annual Indian Achievement Award. The 48th award will be presented to Governor Robert E. Lewis, Zuni Pueblo, of Zuni, New Mexico at the Annual Achievement award dinner tonight.

Edith Jones

There are many outstanding Indian women in the Chicago Indian Community, one of these is Edith Jones, a Winnebago/Nez Perce from the Winnebago, Nebraska reservation, she is a retired registered nurse and has been a member of the Chicago Community for around 40 years. She took her nurses training in Ft. Wayne, Indiana. Upon completion she came to Chicago because she knew that there were Indians here. Edith took time away from her profession to spend seven years as a caseworker with St. Augustine's Center. Currently Edith is a volunteer for the Red Cross and now has applied for the Peace Corp. She will receive an assignment overseas before long. Edith Jones has two sons. Her son Harold graduated from the University of Illinois and although successful in the business world decided to go back to school to become a lawyer. 2,700 applicants took the exam hoping for one of the 175 slots available at Northwestern University. He was successful and is now attending Northwestern.

This is an Indian woman who came to Chicago before relocation, married and raised a family, and made a success-

ful career for herself and can be proud of the second generation son, Harold, raised and educated in the Chicago urban community.

These Indian people have not severed ties with the Indian Community regardless of their success. They are involved, they still value their culture and tradition, join in the community activities, serve on boards, take part in Pow-Wows.

Anyone who says there is no difference between Latinos, Blacks and other minorities is forgetting Indian history and the role the Federal Government has played in the lives of the American Indian.

Other minorities and immigrants coming here already had occupations and placed a high value on materialism it was not hard for them to assimilate and compete racially and individually.

The American Indian population has steadily increased into the Urban areas and now it is pretty evenly divided between city and reservation. In Chicago the heaviest concentration is in the Uptown area and spreading north and west. Unemployment is high bringing with it many related problems.

When Federal Assistance Programs called for Indian Control and Administration it found the Indian people lacking in experience in management or even in their own affairs due to the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the attitudes and

policies of the dominant society up until this time. Disorganization and confusion were the result with lack of cooperation from many people in the community. However, we now have Indian people who are now beginning to show their leadership ability. They are NOT ignoring these problems, hoping they will go away!

In Chicago we have organizations that have become an important part of the community such as:

1. The American Indian Center--Incorporated in 1954, but of course it had been in formation for several years previously.
2. St. Augustine's Center founded by Father Peter Powell in 1958. St. Augustine's Alcohol Drop-In Center, Bo-She-Nee-ge since 1973, and now the much needed Emergency Center for Abused Children will open soon.
3. Native American Committee since 1970 also has a Senior Center Program.
4. Adult Education Program.
5. Native American Outpost.
6. American Indian Health Services of Chicago.
7. American Indian Business Assoc. Training and Employment--XETA.
8. American Indian Brotherhood, Bollingbrook, Illinois (Alcohol Program).
9. Indian Council Fire.

10. American Indian Chapel.

And most important--education and Training provided by--

11. Native American Educational Service.

12. Truman College.

13. Native American Studies, University of Illinois.

14. Little Big Horn High School.

YES, we are doing something because--The hope that Indian and Alaskan Native cultures can be preserved lies with the children. They must have access to the best possible areas of education and they must be taught Native tradition. Opportunity does exist and more Indians are becoming skilled and knowledgeable.

We have National Indian Organizations that are working for changes for both the reservation and Urban Indians. I belong to the National Indian Council on Aging an advocacy group that has been able to bring some of the badly needed changes for the elderly Indians in the United States and Alaska. Concerted advocacy efforts put forth by Indian tribes and organizations led to the Title VI amendment to the Older Americans Act for direct funding to Indian tribes. There is much more to be done because as it has often been said, the first Americans are the forgotten Americans and of these the Older Indians are the most forgotten of all. All we ask is to keep our place as we have always had and to be able to live out our days in dignity the dignity we deserve.

INDIANS IN THE SAN FRANCISCO
BAY AREA

by
Ann Metcalf, Ph.D.

From 1961-63 Joan Ablon did the field research for her now classic study of relocated Indians in the San Francisco Bay Area. In the nearly twenty years that has elapsed from the time of that study, much has happened which has changed the picture of urban Indians and she painted it. And yet, curiously, many of her basic observations remain true today. In this paper, I will highlight what I believe to be among the most important comparisons and contrasts with Ablon's early work.

This paper is organized in roughly chronological order--covering first the decade from 1960-1970 and then from 1970 to the present. In many ways the history of Indians in the Bay Area parallels that in the other metropolitan areas designated by the Bureau of Indian Affairs as relocation centers. But there was one event which San Francisco had that the other cities did not and that was Alcatraz. The Indian occupation of the former Federal prison marks a turning point for Indians in the Bay Area and had an important impact on the development of Indian programs. To understand why, it is necessary to know something of the conditions which lead up to it.

Throughout the 1960s, the Indian population in California increased at an unprecedented rate so that Indians became the state's fastest growing minority. This increase

was due almost entirely to urban relocation in Los Angeles and San Francisco. The influx to the cities is clearly indicated by the following figures: in 1950, 26 percent of California Indians lived in cities and towns; in 1960, 53 percent; in 1970 the figure was closer to 76 percent (California State Department of Health). In the San Francisco Bay Area alone, the Indian population had doubled during the 1960s, going from Ablon's estimate of 10,000 in 1961 to 20,000 or more in 1970.

Detailed and accurate populations statistics on urban Indians are virtually impossible to find. When I began my field work in 1970, the estimates of 20,000 to 25,000 Indians in the Bay Area came from "best guesses" made by the staffs of the various Indian organizations. Their figures differed sharply from the ones issued in the 1970 census. According to the latter, Indians in the combined SMSA's that make up the Bay Area numbered 16,448. The disparity in figures can logically be explained in one of two ways: either the Indian agencies' estimates were severely overstated or the U.S. Census figures were not accurate.

Most observers, including Census officials themselves, chose the second explanation. The difference between the total count of the entire enumerated Indian population and the summary totals of the 20 percent sample is a -3.7 percent. what this means is that any figures relating

to Indians in urban areas--which are based on the 20 percent sample and not the total count--are likely to be off by about 4 percent. Using that fact, 1970 totals for the Bay Area can be set at 17,057.

Even that correction is based on completed Census data. What is more pertinent is the very high probability that large numbers of Indians never made it into the Census at all. As one report put it: "On the basis of various sources of data, we can be almost certain that there is a serious undercount of Indians, probably worse than for any other group in the society" (U.S. Office of Special Concerns, 1974:8). Reasons given include the highly transient nature of the population, language and cultural barriers, confusion of Indian identity with other non-white groups. One important factor was the decision to use the race of the father in cases of mixed parentage. Since recognized Indian descent often includes quarter bloods and since some 38 percent of all married Indian women have non-Indian spouses, this practice left out a significant number of persons (especially children) who would otherwise qualify as being Indian.

In 1973, Fuchs did a survey of a sample of Indians whose names were garnered from BIA lists, Indian agencies and through friends and neighbors. 5,434 names, each representing a family, were thus identified. Fuchs estimated average family size at 3.5 and arrived at a total of 19,000

Indians in the three Bay area counties of San Francisco, Alameda (Oakland) and Santa Clara (San Jose).

His study provided one of the only breakdowns by tribes that is available, he identified 79 tribes. The largest single tribe was Navajo whose members made up 8 percent of his sample; next came Sioux at 7 percent. All California tribes combined totaled 28 percent. Grouped by geographic/cultural area the distribution is as follows:

California	28.3%	Plains	21.0%
Southwest	17.1	Non-Indian	10.9
Mixed	6.1	Pacific Northwest	5.8
Other	4.3	Eskimo and Alaskan	3.7
No answer	2.7		

Fuchs regarded the California Indian sample as the most representative because the names were drawn from the California Indian Legal Services, an agency which was litigating land claims and thus had access to all known tribal members. Because he encountered many of the same problems which the Census ran into and because the sample was biased towards those Indians who frequent Indian centers and/or utilize Indian agencies, Fuchs was not as confident about the representation of the non-California tribes. Therefore, it is possible that the California tribes were somewhat over represented in his sample.

However, given the above caveats, we can conclude from Fuch's study that no less than 70 percent of the Bay

Area Indians were far from their home reservations. It is also clear that there was no single predominant tribal group.

Although the Census tables are not useful for ascertaining the absolute number of Indians, they are useful for ascertaining the relative socioeconomic position which Indians occupied in 1970. Compared to other groups in our society, Indians:

- were more often unemployed
- when employed, received ~~lower wages~~
- had less education
- suffered more ~~health problems~~
- had more substandard housing
- had more single-mother families
- had higher arrest rates.

The studies which are done on urban Indians throughout the 1960s do not emphasize the bleak statistics cited above. For the most part, the literature reflects traditional anthropological concerns--with the development of a tri-valued identity (Molohan, 19), with the maintenance of certain culturally based social structures (Williard, 19).

But it was the harsh economic reality that concerned the Indians themselves--how to get a decent job, how to get and stay healthy, how to become educated and how to feed one's children. The Alcatraz project brought these issues to light.

The 1960s was a time of unrest for many segments of this society and Indian activism had also begun to make an impact. But most of the Indian protest movements in the 1960s were local and reservation based--the most notable being the fishing rights movement in the Pacific Northwest. Alcatraz, in contrast, was not only pan-tribal but it also included the first public forum for urban Indians.

Alcatraz Island is located in the middle of the San Francisco Bay. For decades it served as the most notorious maximum security prison in the country. In 1963, the Federal government closed the prison and the island was officially declared surplus government property. ~~Throughout the 1960s~~ several proposals were offered ~~for the island including~~ turning it into a gambling resort--a sort of Monaco West.

But in November 1969 a group of Indian college students had other ideas. The San Francisco Indian Center had burned down and there seemed to be no help forthcoming to rebuild it, So the students decided to launch a co-ordinated invasion of Alcatraz, claim it as surplus property under an old Sioux treaty and establish a Native American Cultural Center, run by the Indians to suit the needs of Indians as Indians themselves saw them.

Although Alcatraz was not a local protest but encompassed the concerns and garnered the support of Indians throughout the country, it nonetheless had its most immediate effect on the Bay area. For years, Indian groups in California had been working hard to made the needs of

Indians--both rural and urban--known and understood. And, for urban Indians--who had up until Alcatraz been what Bahr (19) called the "invisible minority"--the message of Alcatraz was extremely important.

With the characteristic humor so well described by De Loria, (19) the Indian declared that Alcatraz already had all the necessary features of a reservation: "dangerously uninhabitable buildings, no fresh water, inadequate sanitation and the certainty of total unemployment (Collier, 1970:8). They announced ~~that they would establish~~ a Bureau of Caucasion Affairs and ~~make the 5 full-time caretakers~~ wards of their new government. ~~They offered to pay~~ a reasonable, equitable amount for the Rock--\$24.00 in glass beads.

Within two weeks of this declaration, after a series of political strategy sessions, over 100 persons flooded the Island and the Alcatraz occupation went into full swing. the publicity which resulted from this action took international as well as national proportions. Indians from all over the country and from all tribes came to join the dogged force. Non-Indians rallied with material support including helping to run the ludicrous blockade thrown up by the Coast Guard. By and large the press was sympathetic and the government embarrassed.

By highlighting the Alcatraz protest, I do not mean to imply that Alcatraz caused the subsequent changes in the

urban Indian scene. Alcatraz became the symbol, the rallying point, the boost which many Indian groups and individuals needed to solidify their respective goals and press on for self-determination. For non-Indians, including government officials and funding agencies, Alcatraz made the needs of contemporary Indians visible and immediate.

One way to understand the impact which Alcatraz had is to compare some of Ablon's observations with the situation in the early 1970s, during and shortly after the Alcatraz occupation. ~~Let's start by looking at the growth~~ of Indian organizations. In 1960, Ablon found 21 such groups. Among ~~them were tribal clubs, Christian churches,~~ dance/powwow clubs, athletic teams, the Haskell Alumni and the Native American Church. There were two Indian centers, one in San Francisco and one in Oakland. Only one of the organizations listed by Ablon had a specific problem orientation and that was the San Jose Indian Alcoholics Anonymous.

The Indian Centers according to Ablon were ". . . social centers with regular programs of social-recreational activities." Intertribal Friendship House in Oakland provides a good example. It was established by the Quakers through the American Friends Service Committee in 19 , and provided a place for Indians to congregate for dinners, pow wows, dances and athletics. There were some social services offered and a non-Indian social worker was available for

families in need, but the social work services were limited.

At the time of Ablon's study, the only organization with an admittedly political function was the American Indian Council of the Bay Area. It was an intertribal area-wide group and had at that time just taken over the governance of the San Francisco Indian Center from the Society of St. Vincent De Paul which had initially sponsored it. Ablon noted that the Council had, ". . . in recent years came into national notice by the widely publicized criticisms of the Relocations programs." As has been seen, such criticisms were a portent of things to come.

In 1971, the year after Alcatraz, the Human Rights Commission of San Francisco compiled a directory of California Indian organizations. For the Bay area, 40 such groups were listed (almost double what Ablon found). Most persons agree that the list was far from complete. For example, only one of the Christian churches mentioned by Ablon was listed by the Human Rights Commission, although all were still in existence at that time. Some tribal clubs were mentioned, but dance groups were not. However, even given these limitations, the list was indicative of more than a mere proliferation of organizations. The character and functions of the organizations had changed profoundly.

Only six of the groups listed were strictly recreation or cultural in their orientation. These included

tribal clubs, athletic teams and native art groups. Five of the organizations were student associations at local colleges and universities. Eight groups were organized to deliver specific services mostly health related. Seven were frankly political action-groups, which did not offer services but which circulated newsletter and provided a forum for activism. There were seven groups which formed a miscellany including research, business and religious organizations. The three Indian centers--San Francisco, Intertribal in Oakland, and San Jose--still provided general social and recreational activities. But, in addition, each had added some aspect of a service delivery component such as job counseling, case work, health outreach, distribution of food and clothing. There were also four general purpose, intertribal groups which sometimes performed the same functions along with sponsoring pow wows and athletic teams.

In sum, then, over half of all agencies listed had social service or political activism as a major focus. In soliciting contributions for their programs and in persuading funding agencies to back them, the groups had to argue (1) that Indians were in need, and (2) that there was no alternative means of meeting such a need. In establishing the latter point, the Indians contended that when they went to non-Indian agencies for help they were referred to the Bureau. But when they went to the Bureau, they were told to use the same non-Indian agencies that everyone else

in the city used. This Catch 22 situation caused considerable mistrust and bitterness between Indians and the staff of the three Relocation offices.

An illustration of the mutual hostility and suspicion that often flared up between the Bureau and local Indian groups can be seen in the events surrounding the creation of a San Jose group which called itself the Core Team. This group was composed of representatives of most of the Indian organizations of the Bureau's San Jose Employment Assistance Office. Many of them had been on Alcatraz and all certainly were inspired by the message of Indian self-determination that the island occupation bespoke. When then President Nixon made his famous speech, the Core Team took him literally, Nixon declared: "The time has come to break decisively with the past and to create the conditions for a new era in which the Indian future is determined by Indian acts and Indian decisions."

They cited the following grievances:

- that the Bureau coerced Indians to leave the reservation, and, when in the city, used, as counselors, non-Indians who did not understand Indian ways or needs,
- that subsistence allowances were inadequate,
- that the job training programs were ineffective and aimed at low-skilled, demeaning jobs. (The standard joke was that a trainee got a choice of occupations--either welder or beautician, depending on the sex of the applicant),

--that the Bureau was unsuccessful in finding the person a suitable job after training was complete.

But the biggest complaint of all was that urban Indians who were not on a vocational training or employment assistance program were not served by the BIA. The Core Team maintained that all Indians in the city should have access to Bureau services regardless of whether or not they had come on a Relocation program. Furthermore, they contended that full services should be provided from training and job finding to housing to medical care to recreational and educational facilities.

Since the Bureau was not providing such comprehensive services, the Core Team declared that they would do so themselves. They first tried to get money directly from the San Jose Office. The move astounded the Director (who was not Indian) and what ensued was a bitter exchange of memos and phone calls. The Core Team demanded to be given a list of names and addresses of active relocatees as well as a complete budget breakdown of the BIA's current operating expenditures by function. They wanted the names because they wanted to do an evaluation; i.e., they wanted to survey the relocatees to ask their opinions of the services which they received. They wanted the budget so that they could demonstrate that they could accomplish the various tasks more cheaply and efficiently than the Bureau.

The Director refused to release the names, citing

the individual relocatee's right of privacy; and, because the demands were, from the Director's point of view, so outrageous and aggressive, she became defensive and also refused to release what could otherwise be considered more or less public information--namely, the figures on budget, function and number of persons relocated, trained and/or placed on jobs.

Since it became clear that the local office would neither fund alternative programs nor step aside and let the Core Team take over, they decided to take their case directly to the headquarters office and ask for contract money. At about this time, January, 1971, I was contacted by a Core Team member to help put together a proposal which was to be delivered to Washington, D.C. at the BIA Commission's office. The proposal was extremely comprehensive and called for the following:

- an employment training and placement program
- counseling and social services
- a complete school system, pre-school through high school
- a recreation facility
- a cultural, media center

All of this was to be housed in one facility. The total budget was 3 million dollars. In order to gauge the magnitude of the figure, compare it to the annual BIA field office budget of \$1.3 million for fiscal 1970. Well, they

took the proposal to D.C.; they didn't get the \$3 million but they did come back with a \$50,000 contract which sufficed to get the fledgling San Jose Indian Center off the ground.

This episode, which actually is only one of many of its kind that I had an opportunity to participate in during the early 1970's, points up the highly divergent perspectives from which the two sides were operating. Actually, the Core Team's charge that the Bureau did not meet the needs of urban Indians did nothing to wound the Bureau's image of itself. The Bureau never ~~intended~~ to serve the needs of urban Indians; it was in ~~business~~ to serve the needs of reservation Indians. The object was to bring reservation Indians into the city and assist them until they became urban citizens. Their needs then should be met, according to the tenets of the program, by the same institutions that served all the other citizens in that urban area. Viewed in this way, the Bureau field offices could be seen as extensions of the various area offices. All action regarding a relocatee was to be begun at the reservation office. Once a trainee completed a program in the city, he or she either had to make it alone or go back to the reservation and start all over again. The San Jose office sometimes took an expedient which other offices had adopted--and that was to send the person's papers back to be processed rather than the more expensive procedure of sending the person back.

On the other hand, the Indians who were protesting this policy argued that the Bureau was the Bureau. Its function was to serve Indians no matter where they were. Besides, they said, Indians would probably have never dreamed up the idea to come to the city on their own; therefore, since Relocation was the Bureau's idea, the Bureau needed to take responsibility.

Throughout the 1970s with a few exceptions notable primarily because they are exceptions, the BIA has maintained its view of itself as reservation-based and reservation-bound. In this position, they have been supported by tribal governments on reservations who fear that if money starts going into the city, their own programs will be cut accordingly. The tensions thus created between reservation and urban programs has at times become severe and, as we shall see later, remains to this day.

Most critics of the Bureau's program point to the high recidivism rate. Ablon estimated an initial rate of 75 percent which in the early 1960s had reduced to 35 percent. It is difficult as both Sorkin (19) and Neils (19) point out to get an adequate measure of return rate for Bureau relocatees. Furthermore, it appears that a sizable number of returnees eventually come back to the city.

In response to the criticisms based on the high return rate, Sorkin reported that in 1972 the Bureau began to change its policies with regard to urban relocation. It

began to shift its employment placement and vocational training programs from urban centers to reservation areas. The impact of the shift on the Bay Area, which included a slow down in the numbers of Indians brought in on relocation, can be seen in the gradual phasing out of the three BIA offices. First, the San Francisco operations were transferred to Oakland, then San Jose office was also closed and its operations similarly transferred. By 1976, when another survey of Indian organizations was conducted, only one relocation office remained.

Nonetheless, in-migration appears to have increased with or without Bureau subsidy. Other forms of subsidy have become available, notably scholarship and fellowship programs which bring in students to the major universities in the area--e.g., Berkeley, Stanford, San Francisco State. Some of the programs of study lead to a baccalaureate and others to professional degrees such as MPH, MSW, MBA. Many of the students who are thus brought into the area do not stay, but return to their reservation or home areas. However, while they are here, they exert an important influence. They work on committees, help draft proposals, conduct evaluations and provide a source of energy for activism.

Another source of in-migration is those persons who come to join family and friends. Ablon established that about one-third were self-relocated at the time of her

study; in the early 1970s when I did my field work, the estimate was 50 percent.

Furthermore, migration is no longer the only source of increase in urban Indian populations. Whereas, at the time of Ablon's study in 1961 virtually every urban Indian had been born on a reservation or recognized tribal lands, by 1970 many had been born in the city. The increase in the population of Indian children in the city, spurred the development of several programs. The latest count of Bay Area Indian organizations ~~showed that~~ of the total of 49 agencies, one in seven focused on children. ~~They included~~ pre-school, tutoring, ~~child protective services,~~ educational programs, etc. All of them have as a major goal to retain an Indian identity for urban Indian children.

While the proliferation of Indian agencies including the child-oriented ones speak to the persistent movement toward self-determination, they also raise questions as to just what does it mean to run an Indian program from an Indian perspective for the maintenance of an Indian identity? How is that perspective different from any other perspective? What is a "successful" Indian? Or, for that matter, just what is an Indian?

That last question has plagued researchers, demographers, agency personnel and Indians themselves. The standard BIA answer is that an Indian is someone who is at least quarter blood and is enrolled in a recognized tribe.

There are many problems with using that definition. One is that there are many non-recognized tribes. Another is that some people with less than quarter blood grew up in an Indian community and thus "think Indian" and "live Indian." In contrast, some full-bloods grew up as non-Indians or have decided not to identify as Indians.

I have heard Indians engage in long debates about who is a "real" Indian. To some the term refers to someone who looks and dresses Indian, speaks a native language, grew up on a reservation and is practicing certain Indian religious rites. Such a definition of course, leaves out people born in cities who never had a chance to learn a native language or religion.

For some people, to say "successful Indian" is a contradiction in terms. It almost seems as if these people feel that a "real" Indian must suffer all the social and economic problems to qualify for Indian status. If someone has managed to maintain a reasonable standard of living as measured in Anglo terms, then that person must be acculturated or assimilated and therefore not really Indian any more. The argument is related to the Bureau's argument; namely, that to succeed, an Indian must learn to be Anglo and by so doing will cease to be Indian and become an ordinary urban citizen.

Gradually through the 1970s, more and more people--Indians, social scientist, service providers--have refused

to take such an either/or stance. Instead, they assert that Indians can be both successful and remain Indian. In anthropological terms, this view is known as biculturation and stands in contradiction to the earlier acculturation theories.

Success is fairly easy to measure; it means having a good job, good home, decent education, material comforts and a certain level of psychological or personal adjustment. Whereas, "Indian" in this context refers sometimes to behavior patterns and sometimes to values and beliefs.

When I did my early field work ~~in 1970-72~~, I was struck by the fact that many of ~~the~~ women I interviewed were making it in the city and they were also undeniably Navajo. In an attempt to quantify what was at first an impressionistic assertion, I took measures on both an acculturation scale and a traditionalism scale. The measures for acculturation--virtually synonymous for "successful adaptation"--included: level of education, occupational prestige, residence, material possessions. They were derived from other studies of urban Indians and seemed reasonably comparable to what the Bureau and the Indian as well, define as success (Refs.). The measures of traditionalism included: participation in Sings or ceremonies, use of native language, participation in clan system, number of visits to reservation. They were also designed to be in accord with what other researchers and Indians mean

when they define Indianness. I had read McFee's article on the 150 Percent Man (19) and took to heart his exhortation to measure each person on both scales if logical and reasonable conclusions are to be reached.

Sure enough, I found empirically that the most successful urban migrants also ranked very high on the traditional Navajo scale. So, it did not appear to be necessary to give up being Navajo in order to be successful. In fact, it began to look like the way to be successful was to remain as Navajo as possible. These findings give credence to the growing evidence of the success of biculturation.

In a study designed to investigate the socialization of Indian children into the city, the Native American Research Group at Scientific Analysis is reaching the same conclusions. They began in 1972 by studying 120 urban Indian families from four tribal groups--Navajo, Sioux, California, and others. The families have been followed for seven years. A little over one-half (62) are still in the study sample. (Many of the remainder have returned to the reservation so there has also been an opportunity to compare stayers and leavers.)

To test the biculturation hypothesis, the group developed two scales: one to measure traditionalism and one to measure assimilation. The items on the scales were similar to those I had used and which have been used elsewhere. The scales, once derived, divided the sample into four dis-

tinct groups. One group was composed of those who ranked high on both scales--High Traditional and High Assimilation. This group became known as the biculturation group. The second ranked high on Assimilation and low on Traditionalism; they were termed the acculturated group. The High Traditional Low Assimilation group was simply called traditional, and the people who scored low on both scales were called "marginal," that is, they belonged to neither way of life. The prediction was that the bicultural families would be those who fared best, the marginal families would have the most problems and the acculturated and traditional families would fall somewhere between.

For measures of personal adjustment such as self-esteem, and mental health (via the Cornell Medical Index) those predictions have held.

To see how these research findings can be translated into action programs--especially those whose goals are to aid urban Indian children while maintaining their Indian identity, I'd like to describe one program in particular with which I have been connected off and on since 1975.

The Urban Indian Child Resource Center in Oakland (CRC) was initially funded by a grant from the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect and was, in a sense, a precursor to the newly passed Indian Child Welfare Act. From the activities of CRC much can be learned about Bay Area Indians in the post-Alcatraz decade.

The project provides an excellent example of what many urban Indians mean when they talk about self-determination. The model of service delivery which it has developed, has shown that self-determination means more than having Indians do the same things that Anglos do. The point is, that the Indians at the CRC developed a treatment program that builds on Indian cultural antecedents and stands in contrast to Anglo-run programs.

CRC started because of the alarming rate of removal of children from Indian homes. The socioeconomic problems faced by Indian families combined with ethnocentric Anglo child welfare policies so that non-Indian social workers, who determined that Indian children were in need of foster care, often placed these children in non-Indian homes. Once placed, the children rarely if ever returned home.

CRC's approach was first to work with the families so as to strengthen the parent-child bond and only as a last resort, remove the child for foster placement. In doing so, CRC has been careful not to remove the child from his/her culture. This task is accomplished by placing the child in an Indian home, preferably with relatives or Indians from the same tribe.

Placing the child does not end the treatment process, but is only one step toward eventual unification of the family. In accomplishing this goal, the Center uses the services of what it has called the Family Support Network.

These are Indian families who provide foster homes for children, work with the case workers in helping parents, and serve as models of successful urban adjustment for families experiencing difficulties. An analysis of the people connected with CRC can thus give us a picture of both the special problems faced by Indians in the second decade of relocation as well as a portrait of the strengths in urban Indian families.

A composite case history analysis revealed two basic types of client families. ~~In the first type, which represents new migrants to the city, the parents are at risk of losing their children because they cannot meet their basic physical needs.~~ Usually these families are young, have just arrived from the reservation on Relocation, have few salable job skills and virtually no urban survival strategies in their repertoire.

They are in the city because there are no jobs back home. They often have adequate parenting skills which would be sufficient in a supportive environment such as an extended family household in a rural setting. However, alone in the city they are unable to provide shelter, food, medical care, etc. for their children.

They cannot find work because they have had no adequate education or training in reservation schools. Their already lowered self-image suffers further assaults by the repeated failures in the city, and they are left with little

sense of competence or worth. They often do not know how to obtain welfare or subsidized medical care, and are very suspicious of all bureaucratic agencies. They are socially isolated and fearful; tragically, they often see their only alternative to be to turn the responsibility for their children over to someone else. The pressures on this type of family are so acute that without assistance the parents could easily fall into a cycle of despondency, alcoholism and failure, from which it becomes harder and harder to recover.

The second type of family, or ~~second generation~~, involves parents, usually ~~single mothers~~, who moved from the reservation when they were children in one of the first Relocation families. Their parents, the children's grandparents, arrived in the city and faced the problems outlined above for new migrants. They did not receive the help they needed, and the family gradually dissolved.

Usually the parents in CRC's second generation cases were removed from their own parents and placed in non-Indian foster homes. They often were transferred from home to home, usually in families with resources that placed them not far above the poverty line. The children had begun schooling on the reservation, had very poor command of English, and because of this inadequate preparation suffered a cycle of failure in urban schools.

By the time they came to the Center's attention,

they had slipped into street life, and their children, who frequently were the results of adolescent pregnancies, had been taken from them. Because their natal families had been disrupted when they were children, and because they had suffered the cultural disruption of the reservation-to-urban shift, they never developed an adequate sense of ethnic or personal identity. Nor did they have an opportunity to develop parenting skills, let alone strategies of responsible self-care.

The Indian family support system in the city is based on and grew out of the extended-family tradition inherent in most Native American groups. One important problem for most Indian families who attempted to make a rural-to-urban transition has been that the extended family system was broken. Relatives were left at home or, if there were relatives in the city, Anglo customs and housing laws are such that large groups of people are not welcomed under one roof. In addition, due to BIA Relocation policies, Native American peoples have not usually settled into enclaves or Indian Neighborhoods. They are usually found dispersed throughout various locales over the metropolitan areas. Despite the potential for isolation of Indian families due to such physical separation, most Indian people living in the city have felt strongly that they should help each other. Tribal groups and customs are recognized and appreciated, but the concern for helping out another Indian

person goes far beyond tribal lines. The problem before the Center started was that there had been no easy way to link these individual families, willing to support each other, together in a viable system.

The Indian families who make up the Family Support Network do not constitute a homogeneous group. They come from many different tribes (about 40 in all) and are varied in terms of education, occupation, length of time in the city and residence. They all share one quality and that is a sense of being Indian. For many, this identity is reinforced and maintained by participating in such social and recreational activities as all Indian athletic events or regular attendance at pow wows.

About one-third of the FSN family do not attend pow wows or other Indian specific activities. Many of these families have been in the urban area for some time, and often their children are no longer young. The key, however, for understanding these families' concern for Indian children (as is true among the other families of the Family Support Network) is a strong sense of being Indian and feeling good about it. For this group, the notion of "Indian-ness goes beyond over behavioral categories such as going to pow wows or Indian centers.

A second group of families in the FSN are those that have more recently suffered greatly in adapting to the urban environment. They maintained and survived because of

a strong sense of family unity, are now on firm ground and want to help make it a little easier for other Indian people who are in the same situation they once faced. Often these families were at one time clients at CRC and had used the Family Support Network themselves. When they became stable, they in turn offered to become a part of the FSN.

The last group of families that make up the Family support Network are those that are new to the city. Whether their present situation is "stable" or not, they have a strong sense of the ~~traditional~~ importance of the family in their respective tribal groups and ~~among Indian peoples~~ as a whole. Because they do ~~not have relatives and close~~ friends in the urban area, they want to be with other Indian people and help where they can.

The way the center makes use of this network is to coordinate it into a surrogate extended family. The case-workers place children in foster families from the network and draw both the natural parents and foster parents together as part of the treatment plan, an important aspect of which includes participation in Center-sponsored potlucks and feasts. What to an outsider may look like pleasant social gatherings--full of fun and little work--are to CRC staff examples of an important treatment mode. These are occasions for building ethnic identity, solidifying families, gaining spiritual guidance through traditional songs and ceremonies, educating children, and in general breaking

through patterns of social isolation. Participation in these events is bolstered by individual and family counseling and coordination of such services as homemaking, health care, employment placement, and tutoring.

So, after a quarter century of relocation and urban migration, what do the 1980s portend for Bay Area urban Indians? If we were to do a count of urban Indian organizations now, we would find one very important change. There is no longer a BIA Relocation Office anywhere in the Bay Area. Exactly two weeks ago (on September 12, 1980) the office in Alameda closed. In doing so, it reflected yet another shift in Bureau policy. As noted above, employment-related programs are now being channeled to reservation and rural areas. Urban training projects that are vocational in nature are being taken over by Indian organizations and are funded by CETA and other such programs. After a long struggle, college and university fellowships are available from the BIA and special professional training programs are continuing to develop--such as the newly established MSW program in the social welfare department at Berkeley funded by the National Institute of Mental Health.

More and more, the agencies and social service organizations which initially relied on indigenous support systems such as the Family Support Network and para professional staff are actively recruiting. In fact, these agencies have become a major source of employment for

Indians in white collar occupations. Furthermore, the services that are being offered are also becoming more complex and specialized. CRC, for example, has recently been funded by a local private foundation to provide mental health services to disturbed children and youth. These services involve sophisticated psychiatric diagnosis and professional therapeutic techniques.

To illustrate the magnitude of this shift in emphasis let me relate an incident that occurred during the writing of the Core Team proposal. I was asked to design a plan for a health clinic which was to include mental services. The typist made a mistake, however, and the manuscript read "Mental Services." This error caused an uproar among some team members who thought that someone (probably me) was accusing Indians of having psychiatric problems. They were convinced, to the contrary, that psychiatry was a completely Anglo invention used to label and oppress non-whites and that any personal adjustment problems which Indians might have, could be solved by providing for their basic survival needs. Whether the current trend toward professionalization also means a shift toward "non-Indianization" of the programs is yet to be seen.

As the BIA tooled down in the Bay Area, there was no indication that urban migration also subsided. In fact, there may be increased migration since not only are young people still coming in from high school or junior college,

but those early migrants who have remained are beginning to import other members of their families--in particular their parents. There is such a sizable group of grandparents in the city now, that CRC has begun a foster grandparent program. Therefore, the age pyramid in the urban Indian population may be changing significantly.

The concern over accurate statistics on the numbers of Indians and their relative socioeconomic standing has once again surfaced. I recently attended a meeting composed of members from the various Indian social service agencies as well as a representative of the Bureau area office in Sacramento. ~~The purpose of the meeting was to~~ evaluate how the various agencies determined the size of their clientele and their respective service needs. Some counted by services--doctor visits, counseling sessions, lunches served. Some counted cases and acknowledged that a single person could represent one or more case. All acknowledged that some of their clientele--an unknown number--would also be counted on other agencies' lists. And finally, all were concerned about the numbers of people who needed service but who, for whatever reason, had never showed up on any agency's role. Thus, the conclusion was that there was no reliable way of gathering the needed statistics.

The BIA presence at the meeting was indicative of yet another shift in policy and one which may have another important implication for urban Indians. The Sacramento

area office has traditionally been oriented toward the rural Indians in California, the native tribal groups who reside on tribal lands known as "rancherias." Until very recently the Sacramento area office has had little to do with urban Indians. However, the new Indian Child Welfare Act emphasizes contracting protective services to Indian agencies. And, the definition of Indian agency is no longer tribally based. That is, not only are reservation/tribal governments recipients, but the Act specifically allows also for pan-tribal organizations which serve urban Indian populations.

The way money is to be allocated under the new act involves a complicated population-based formula. The formula must rely on sound census figures. The fear from the Indian agencies is that the 1980 census will once more contain an undercount of the Indian population and, since their funding depends on the numbers of people who form a potential client pool, that their financial resources will be jeopardized.

The Bureau representative pointed out that not only was it a question of total count that was important but the relative size of the urban population vis-a-vis the rural one. California undoubtedly has the largest Indian population of any state and the overwhelming majority of them--perhaps 80 percent or more--live in the cities. The bureau's area office in Sacramento has up to now primarily served the

state's rural Indians, the native California tribes. Now, it appears that the Bureau's presence will again be felt in the cities, this time not as a representative of reservations but to support urban institutions which serve the needs of urban Indians.

COMMENTS ON ANN METCALF'S PAPER

by

Jennie Joe

Dr. Metcalf has presented us with some useful insights and ways to view changes among Native Americans in the city. Certainly, her comparison of developments through three decades and the sociodemographic changes are important observations. Her analysis of the Alcatraz occupation as a catalytic event which impacted directly and indirectly on the local urban community and, its impact on one longstanding Indian institution--the BIA, is significant in accounting for change. Furthermore, she has enriched her presentation and update with some personal behind-the-scene activities which have led to new and innovative programs and services now operated by urban Indians themselves.

While considerable comments and some disagreements could be made about some of the remarks made by Dr. Metcalf, I feel that one particular point is too important to ignore --the notion of biculturation or biculturalism which is gaining some popularity in the discussion and analysis of Indians in the city. Biculturation, as an analytical term is not new, it has been part of our familiar language baggage, along with other terms, like acculturation, assimilation, adaptation and others.

In Dr. Metcalf's presentation, she refers to biculturation as a label frequently used in the context of distinguishing those Indians who have "successfully" adapted

to both Indian and non-Indian worlds or urban environment. In other words, these individuals who are bicultural are those who are both highly traditional and highly assimilated. Within this context, the notion of biculturation is an interesting one, since, heretofore, it was frequently assumed that the only Indians who were most likely to "succeed" in the so-called mainstream society were those who were reared and stripped of their traditional Indian culture.

As it has been pointed out by Dr. Metcalf, in our present longitudinal study of adaptation of Indian families to the city, it is clear that strong traditional cultural background coupled with certain assimilation traits does make for a more psychologically sound or healthy "bicultural" Indian person or family. In other words, by knowing who they are and where they came from, a well-adjusted bicultural Indian person is one who knows when and where it is appropriate to be Indian and when and where non-Indian behaviors and values are more appropriate. Granted, this idea is also not new. After all, from what we know about human behavior and practical experiences, we can predict that a well "put-together" person can usually overcome most of life's trying circumstances. Based on these convictions, we can say that successful biculturalism is plausible.

However, the measurements and concepts which we generally use to arrive at a definition of a "successful bicultural" person, creates some difficulties, at least for

me. Let me explain what I mean by difficulties. The concept of "success" or successful adaptation which Dr. Metcalf sees as synonymous with acculturation is based on ideologies and social values developed from non-Indian perceptions. Under this definition, then, an Indian person who is a "success" is one who best meets the non-Indian criteria and definition of success. Such a successful urban Indian might be one who is highly educated, enjoys considerable occupational prestige, and is economically well-off.

If a bicultural Indian Person is one who must be successful in both Indian and non-Indian worlds, how do we determine what traditional Indian characteristics make this person a success from an Indian perspective? Who or what determines the criteria we use to measure adequately "successful" traditionalism? Is there a consensus about even what we might refer to as meaning "success" among such a diversity of cultures and tribes? For now, unfortunately, in many instances, variables which we select to measure "successful" maintenance of traditionalism are often variables which automatically fall opposite of non-Indian criteria we use to measure successful assimilation. For example, uneducated, as opposed to educated. But is a highly traditional "successful" Indian person really uneducated? Many of us would say no. Another example: Does the mere fact that someone speaks their native language make

them "successful" traditionally? Why then do we often assume that if an Indian person converses in their tribal language and is more comfortable speaking their tribal tongue that this somehow indicates barriers to successful adaptation? As we know, at least in historical sense, some Indian groups, obviously knew that successful strategies did not always mean verbal communication but, perhaps, facial expressions and/or sign language. Similarly, "success" among some tribes is measured, not by possession of material goods, but by how much of the possession of wealth is shared or given away to others. In this case, it is interesting to see how a successful bicultural person balances these conflicting sociocultural values. These are interesting questions we have yet to explore.

Obviously, I have asked more questions than I have answered. I think this is true for those of us who try to explain various aspects of behavior or processes of change. If there is to be a central idea to be gleaned from what I've tried to say so far--it is acknowledging the fact that we are still a long way from explaining "what characterizes an Indian person who has 'successfully' maintained an equal balance between the Indian and the non-Indian world." Also, that we have paid far more attention to those who have failed to adjust or adapt than those who do. One only has to look over the voluminous articles and publications on

alcoholism problems among Indians, for example, to see the priorities.

On the other hand, Indians, both urban and rural are looking for ways and models which tell about Indian people who are, as Dr. Metcalf has said: "making it."

In much of my work and association with Indian groups in the business of developing services, they frequently remark that they are well aware of the problems and dreary statistics, but they question: "How can we overcome these problems?" Where are the ~~how-to-books~~ on developing traditional cultural strengths, for instance? It is no longer just enough to describe and ~~talk about the problems~~, most Indian people want to do something ~~about the problems~~. They want to help that "marginal" Indian person who is not making it.

These individuals are called "marginal" because they don't seem to really belong to either Indian or Non-Indian world. Within the context of traditionalism and assimilation, for example, these individuals rank low under both sets of criteria. These individuals, as we have seen in our study are Indian people who seem to come from structurally weak family backgrounds and weak cultural background. Similarly, they usually have limited educational or job skills. In other words, they are weak both in their own Indian culture and non-Indian culture. They usually report continuous personal and other situational problems and these

difficulties appear to follow them whether they are in the city or on the reservation. Again, you might think: so what! After all, it is usually taken for granted, at least in the mental health field, that a child who is raised under "unhealthy" circumstances will most likely experience some social or mental problems as an adult. So why should an Indian person under the same circumstances be different? Perhaps from a clinical and behavioral orientation, there is very little difference, but from an Indian perspective, the emphasis and perception of the situation is often different.

For this difference, Dr. Metcalf's presentation illustrates this point very well. For instance, the development of new urban institutions, like the Indian Child Resource Center, is an excellent example. Here, the clinical or social symptoms of problems like child neglect, is viewed by Indian people as resulting from institutional abuse. Thus, the evidence of child neglect is not readily or hastily blamed on the parents as is common practice in non-Indian institutions. Indian parents are assisted in learning how to become better parents and are aided in developing necessary supportive systems in order to cope with other problems that result in child abuse or neglect. This is in many respects what is known as a culturally-relevant approach or therapy. Many of the Indian social workers, for instance, were also raised in institutions like boarding

schools and had little opportunity to learn or observe "good" parenting skills. By incorporating the ideas of extended family within its family support network, this urban Indian program, then strives to strengthen first, the traditional or cultural aspects of living for many of these "marginal" adjusters. These new bicultural institutions, at the same time also maintain their professional agency position by fulfilling all other typical social agency requirements. In staffing, for instance, the majority of the Indian staff are professional trained (out of 25 staff members, only two persons: the psychologist and one social worker are non-Indian).

I guess this one example does illustrate very well what I mean by "Indianizing" existing health and social agency models to help urban Indians. Culturally-relevant services, in this sense, emphasizes positive commonalities among tribes. This is important, for as we all know, it is difficult to be tribally specific in most urban areas, where there is such diversity among tribes and cultures. By looking for and developing positive bicultural models of services--the urban Indians have begun to put into action those things to which many of us have only offered lip service.

COMPARATIVE STUDIES OF INDIANS IN
THE U.S. AND CANADA

by
~~John A. Price~~

INTRODUCTION

Relations with Indians in the U.S. have a more violent history than in Canada. This is primarily because the U.S. had far more tribal level societies than Canada. Tribal level societies, such as the Iroquois, Sioux, Blackfoot, and Pueblos, have consistently been the most resistant to conquest the world over. ~~They are also noted for having the strongest religious revitalizations and political pretests after the conquest has occurred. Canada had a high proportion of the simple and peaceful bands, and a few advanced chiefdoms which tend to be brought into peaceful submission by their own powerful leadership.~~

Three other factors also seem to have favored a more peaceful Indian history in Canada: (1) the relatively humane relationships of the French Canadians; (2) the relatively stable, conservative, and responsible relationships with Indians of the Hudson Bay Company; and (3) the lower population density of both Whites and Indians and thus a lower frequency of Indian-White contacts in Canada. The U.S. had about five times as many Indians as Canada (1.5 million versus 0.3 million).

In both countries the British heritage of policies emphasized the use of reservations. The use of reservations as part of colonial policy was initially advocated by the

English for use in Ireland. In America British reservations were used initially for military containment, displacement from valuable land, and convenient administration. Later more humane policies turned toward such uses as a resource base and homeland that could help sustain Indians as ethnic enclaves. In either case, whether the British were protecting themselves or helping the Indians, the net effect of a reservation policy was racial segregation, a strong colonial dominance, and a continuing lower class status for Indians. In spite of its problems, Native people have usually done better where there was a reservation policy, particularly as you go down the evolutionary scale. People with a band heritage have done much better with reservations or comparable paternalistic supports than when they were left to their own devices to get along in a conquering state society.

The Native displacement in the U.S. was swifter, more violent, and it involved large populations of tribal level societies. Thus the Indians in the U.S. have ended up with fewer and much larger reservations than the Indians in Canada. In the lower 48 states the U.S. has 266 "reservations," "pueblos," "rancherias," and "colonies" plus 35 communities of scattered public domain allotments. In Alaska there are 216 Alaskan communities. The land area is 92.5 million acres of Native and B.I.A. land, excluding 26 small state reserves. The per capita acreage is 154 acres per person.

Canada has 2,242 "reserves" and 85 crown land settlements. That is, 7.7 times as many as the Indian land units in the lower 48 states of the U.S. These reserves and settlements are grouped into 571 "bands," with an average band population of 525 in 1979. The land area of these southern reserves and settlements is about 6.4 million acres. Thus the Indian areas in the lower 48 states is 8.1 times greater than a comparable zone across the Canadian provinces, and excluding the large land areas of the north. The Canadian north is still largely unsettled as far as specific Indian property rights are concerned, so they cannot be fully compared to the Alaskan situation at this time. However, counting just the Category I lands of the James Bay Agreement, the Canadian total is 9.9 million acres or 33 acres per enrolled Indian person. Thus the enrolled U.S. Indians and Eskimos have 4.7 times more trust land on a per capita basis than the enrolled Canadian Indians. This means that the Canadian Indians have a larger number of much smaller and more crowded trust lands. The Navajo Reservation alone has 13.8 million acres, more than double the entire Native trust lands of Canada. The Canadian reserves also tend to be more isolated from urban facilities in a country that is larger than the U.S., with some 40% of the Reserves accessible only by water routes or airplanes.

In absolute terms the U.S. has some 900,000 Natives while Canada has 700,000. However, as a proportion of the

national population Canadian Natives are about seven times more populous than U.S. Natives. Thus Natives have much more of an overall impact in Canadian politics and life in general than Natives do in the U.S. Native organizations in the U.S. go on fighting for years to bring Native symbols and problems to a national level of awareness. For example, they campaigned for a return of the Indian head and buffalo nickel. The Canadian nickel has a beaver, symbol of the fur trade, and the quarter has a moose, another important animal hunted by Indians. The \$2 bill in Canada has a scene of Inuit with kayaks and harpoons. There have been many issues of Canadian stamps with Native themes. C.B.C. radio has had a nation-wide, prime-time program for ten years on "Our Native Land." The amount of influence that Natives have on Canadian life is comparable more to the influence of Blacks in the U.S. than to the U.S. Natives.

Statistical Review:

	<u>U.S.</u>	<u>Canada</u>
Population at first contact:	1.5 million	300,000
Population today, by the criterion of predominant self-identity as Indian, Metis, or Inuit:	900,000	700,000
Enrolled population, served by the Central Government's major Indian agency:	600,000	302,749 Indian 7,550 Inuit
Number of official trust lands:	266 reservations	2,242 Reserves (571 bands)
Other groups of public domain lands held in trust:	35 allotment communities 216 Alaskan communities 26 state reserves	85 crown land settlements Northern settlements Provincial reserves
Land area in million acres:	38.4 on reservations in lower 48 states 12 allotted <u>42.1 in Alaska</u>	6.4 on reserves and crown lands <u>3.5 in James Bay I</u>
Totals:	92.5	9.9
Per capita land area, of serviced population, excluding Alaska and the James Bay Agreement:	84 acres	21 acres
U.S.: 580,000 people on 50.4 million acres -	87 acres per capita	
Canada: 290,000 people on 6.4 million acres -	22 acres per capita	
Per capita land area, of serviced population, including Alaska and category I lands of the James Bay Agreement:		
U.S.: 600,000 people on 92.5 million acres -	154 acres per capita	
Canada: 300,000 people on 9.9 million acres -	33 acres per capita	
Enrolled population as a proportion of the national population:	0.3%	1.3%
Total population as a proportion of the national population:	0.4%	2.8%

INTERNATIONAL VERSUS CULTURAL BORDERS

The cultural environment of the U.S. and British Canada has been basically similar for American Indians and contrasts with the cultural environments of Mexico and French Canada. The Yaqui who moved into Arizona from their ancestral home in Mexico have become like other U.S. Indians while those Yaqui who stayed in Mexico are still much like other northern Mexican Indians. That is, the contextual Mexican or U.S. cultures made a difference in their development. A similar thing happened for a band of Kickapoo who went in the other direction, from Illinois to Oklahoma and then to Mexico. They became Hispanicized, but they were also able to retain more of their traditional culture than their American counterparts.

There was so much movement across the border in the nineteenth century that it is not surprising that Sequoyah, the Cherokee linguist, studied Indian languages in Tamaulipas to see if they were related to Cherokee. Incidentally, he died in Tamaulipas in 1843 while doing this research.

The U.S. and British Canadian cultures, on the other hand have been very similar environments for the Indians. The Iroquois allied with the British during the Revolutionary War were harassed by the Americans at the end of the war so they came to Canada, where in 1784 they were given 70,000 acres of land. Unlike the Mexican cases of Yaqui and Kickapoo international migration, the Iroquois who came to

Canada are still very similar to the Iroquois in the U.S., through parallel developments and actual continuing migrations back and forth. In fact the Iroquois are somewhat unique in North America, and comparable to the Basques of southern France and northern Spain, in that they are culturally unified, nationalistic, and live in a broad area on both sides of an international border.

As a matter of continuing importance to the Iroquois is their freedom to cross the international border. "Jay's Treaty" of Amity, Commerce, and Navigation in 1794 between the U.S. and Britain included provisions for the Indians living in the eastern border area to freely cross the border without payment of customs duties for their personal goods. In modern times this right has been upheld for entry into the U.S., but it has been rejected in Canada. Canada claims that those parts of the early international treaties of the British that involve matters that are internal or domestic to Canada are invalid unless they are ratified by the Canadian Parliament. Canada sees customs as an internal matter. The Canadian Iroquois have protested this interpretation by holding political demonstrations at the border, particularly since 1968.

In 1973, a U.S. federal appeals court ruled that Article III of the Jay Treaty was abolished by the War of 1812 between the U.S. and Britain. Thus Indians lost their freedom from customs duties. However, in 1974 a U.S. court

ruled that for purposes of travel into the U.S., Canadian Indians do not require visas, do not need to register as aliens to live in the U.S., and cannot be deported as aliens.

The Sioux situation is somewhat similar to that of the Iroquois. After Santee Sioux attacks in Minnesota there were American counter-attacks and some Sioux came as refugees to Canada in 1862. The Sioux who escaped harassment in the U.S. after the Battle of the Little Big Horn also came to Canada under the leadership of Sitting Bull and Medicine Bear in 1876 and 1877. The descendants of those people are still very similar to other Sioux in the U.S. In fact, in 1969 some of them in southern Manitoba formed the Dakota Organization of Canada in order to claim a share in land claim settlements as descendants of the Minnesota Santee.

There are several other famous fugitive and refugee groups of Indians who have crossed the international borders. In 1877 the Nez Perce under Chief Joseph fought a defensive retreat for over 1,000 miles through Idaho, Wyoming, and Montana to escape over the Canadian border. Most of them were stopped just short of the line, but White Bird's band made it over the border and beyond the jurisdiction of the U.S. Cavalry. A few Chiricahua and Mescalero Apache groups at the same time were using Mexico as a sanctuary for retreat from their raids into the U.S. The Apache were actually raiding for horses and cattle in Sonora and Chihuahua

through most of the nineteenth century so they knew the country very well. Indian and Metis fugitives of the Riel Rebellion came into the U.S. from Canada after 1885 and settled in with U.S. tribes. The Gros Ventre also left Canada and went to the U.S.

One point of this analysis is that it has been possible for Indians historically to find sanctuary by crossing an international border and thus moving from one national jurisdiction to another. Another point is to examine whether the migration into a new national environment made any significant difference, in terms of long term development, by comparing those members of a single Native society who did not migrate with those who did migrate. The answer is that crossing the international border always led to some interesting political problems, it did lead to different environments in the Mexico-U.S. case, and it did not lead to significantly different environments in the U.S.-Canada case.

There is further support for these conclusions in two other sets of data: (1) where migrations are not involved but the international border divided Native societies that continued to live in their aboriginal areas and (2) the comparison between British and French environments for Indians. From the Micmacs of the Maritimes to the Salish of the Vancouver-Seattle area, Native societies were totally disregarded in establishing the border and they

were divided by the U.S.-Canada border. In fact, it has not made much difference. For example, the major population of Indians in Boston today, about 3,000 are Micmacs who have come from the Canadian Maritimes. The Indians have simply followed the basic flow of travel for work, of Maritimers working in New England rather than in Montreal or Toronto. The Blackfoot of Alberta expanded their territory into Montana in historic times and the cultures on the two sides of the international line are quite similar, both quite entrepreneurial compared to other Indian cultures (Price 1979: Chapter 7). In British Columbia ~~and~~ Washington ~~we~~ know that the Salish visit each other ~~and~~ intermarry across the international line. There is a network of spirit dancing groups, "smokehouse" churches, and Salish winter ceremonials that spans the international border.

Indian territories in the U.S.-Mexico border were also disregarded in drawing up the border, but their location has made more of a difference to them than in the U.S.-Canada area. There are some international ties between Indians along the U.S.-Mexico border as well, but much less. Thus, for example, Indians in Baja California who are very close linguistically and culturally to the Diegueño in California occasionally attend Diegueño festivals in California. However, most of the Indians of Baja California died out in historic times and the few who are left speak Spanish and are quite assimilated into the Mexican popula-

tion. Also the Diegueño festivals attract far more U.S. than Mexican Indians and many of these are not Diegueño, such as Luiseño, Cahuilla, and Yuman.

This discussion involves the method and theory of controlled comparisons. North American Indian history is filled with examples of cultural dynamics and we can test our theories of these processes by controlling the comparisons. When we compare the U.S. and British Canadian contexts we find them generally similar, and contrasting with the Mexican and French ~~Canadian contexts~~.

French Canada has ~~stood out~~ as a significantly different and in modern times as a ~~generally better environ-~~ment for Indians than British North America. The French assumption that Indians will naturally assimilate into their culture has been so great that there has been very little development of a separate policy for Indians. The French, like the Spanish in Mexico, for example, did not make land cession treaties with the Indians and did not create Indian reservations, except to the extent that mission settlements became Indian settlements.

The Hurons who stayed with the French and settled in Loretteville, Quebec have a more cohesive community life than the Hurons who settled in the U.S., with one group called Wyandots eventually settling down in Oklahoma. The Hurons all lost the use of their aboriginal language and became quite assimilated, but the ethnic pride and social

status seems to be higher among the French Hurons than the English Wyandots.

This French-English contrast holds up even when we apply extensive controls to our comparisons. The Cree are an ideal case to do this with because they are the largest (80,000) and most widespread Indian group in Canada. The Cree in the French town of Val d'Or, Quebec do much better (less racism, higher incomes, less crime, etc.) than the Cree in such English towns as Kenora, Ontario and Churchill, Manitoba. Here we have controlled the comparisons and maintained the constants of (1) ~~same Indian society--~~ Cree, (2) ~~same country--~~ Canada, (3) ~~large populations of~~ Indians, (4) all settings are towns, and (5) all towns are in frontier areas of the country. These are all variables which have been shown to be important in other comparisons so they are controlled here. Then we examined the variable of French versus English and found a significant difference.

Compared with other Indians in Canada, Indians in the French environment of Quebec have more intermarriage with Whites, the highest average incomes, the lowest suicide rates, the lowest arrest rates (essentially the same as non-Indians in Quebec), the most prohibition of alcoholic beverages from reserves, and the lowest rate of living off their reserves (18%). Their greater assimilation and acceptance by White society has meant that they have less organized

reaction against White society. Compared to the Indians in British Canada, the Indians of French Canada have a lower level of Indian political activity, fewer voluntary associations, fewer ethnic newsletters, and other signs of modern ethnic associations. They tend to be only weakly integrated with the general pan-Indian movements of North America and to have their own contrasting ethnic movements.

Review: The international borders have not been nearly as important for Indians as the cultural borders between different White societies. ~~Thus the acculturation experiences have been radically different between the contexts of Mexico, French Canada, and British North America.~~

EVOLUTIONARY LEVELS

Even more important than the White cultures per se as factors in patterning the relationships between Whites and Indians has been the amount of the evolutionary gap between the societies and the specific evolutionary types that are in conflict. White societies came to the Americas as colonial imperial states. The colonial imperial states have usually been quite brutal, whether they were Europeans, Aztecs, or Incas. They were far more developed than the primitive bands, tribes, ~~and chiefdoms they met north of~~ Mexico.

Band level societies were easily displaced or manipulated, the tribal level societies gave the most military and religious resistance, and the chiefdoms were usually coerced into cooperation through their own strong leadership. The band heritage is very egalitarian and their politics is still that way so they have had a very difficult time forming large, strong, and cohesive organizations to deal effectively with White governments. They were quite passive with the coming of the Europeans. And they are just now, for the first time in their histories, building these large scale political organizations. The 1970's saw the formation of Inuit Tapirisat, which wants much more control over Arctic Canada. During the Mackenzie Valley Pipeline Inquiry another new group of several Indian

societies called the Dene Nation helped to block the development of a pipeline down the Mackenzie Valley, in favor of a more traditional hunting and fishing way of life. The James Bay Agreement was signed in 1975 by new political organizations representing the Cree and the Inuit of Quebec.

The tribal heritage societies of Canada are only in the southern fringe and are somewhat inactive today. They are represented by the agricultural Huron and Iroquois in the east, the buffalo hunting Blackfoot in the Prairies, and Salish of southern British Columbia. These are societies that are somewhat unified politically and have long had society-wide organizations, around such things as religion and warfare. They were the most trouble to the Europeans, because of their aboriginal warfare and yet a political cohesion that was too weak to control the independent actions of individuals. The tribes have a long history of protests, but now tend to be more integrated into Canadian society than people of a band heritage.

Most of the U.S., by contrast, was covered by military-oriented tribes that quite effectively resisted conquest, and often turned to religious movements when they were conquered. The Longhouse Society, Sun Dance, Peyotism, Ghost Dance in its inter-tribal form, and the Salish Guardian Spirit Ceremonial are all associated with tribal level societies.

There are few chiefdom level societies in Canada

and these were all in the rich fishing areas of coastal British Columbia, such as the Nootka and Kwakiutl of Vancouver Island, the Haida of the Queen Charlotte Islands, and the Tsimshian of the northern coast. These were class-structured, slave-holding societies that bargained very effectively through their strong chiefs with the Europeans. Their protests and organizations were much more sophisticated than any other Indians in Canada and as such often set the patterns for the rest of the country.

People from the B.C. coastal chiefdoms started such modern forms as the province-wide political organizations, usually called brotherhoods or unions, land claims against the government, and Indian women's organizations. Unfortunately, the governments reacted against the sophistication by not making treaties with the B.C. Indians, by outlawing their religious practices from 1884 to 1951, and by outlawing their political fund raising in 1927--in order to cripple their ability to fight land claim cases. The U.S. parallels are the massive yet surprisingly peaceful removal of the Southeast chiefdoms to Oklahoma and the great early contributions of the Five Civilized Societies to pan-Indian culture.

As an element in urbanization, the more advanced the evolutionary heritage the more organized and the less traumatic has been the urban adaptation. Thus the chiefdoms of the Southeast U.S., their descendants in Oklahoma,

and the chiefdoms of British Columbia set most of the early models for Indian associations, newspapers, appeals to the government, land claims cases, and so forth. The tribes, such as the Iroquois, Pueblos, and Blackfoot, tended to go through long phases of militant and religious revitalization before they engaged in modern forms of political action. The largely passive history of bands, such as Eskimos, northern Dene, and Paiutes, ended only in the 1970s with the formation of large political associations for the first time in their entire histories. The band heritage societies are in the Great Basin of the U.S. and across the Arctic and Subarctic. They are just now becoming urbanized. When we speak of the extreme difficulties of urban migration and adaptation in Alaska and Canada we are talking primarily about people with a band heritage: especially Aleuts, Yuit, Inuit, northern Dene, Cree, Ojibwa, and Micmac. In a city such as Toronto it is the newly arrived Ojibwa and Cree who are having the severe problems, not the thousands of fairly assimilated Iroquois who live in Toronto. According to this hypothesis, cities such as Anchorage and Fairbanks in Alaska should be seeing far more problems among the Yuit and Inuit than the Tlingit.

Correlated with evolutionary level, but somewhat separated from it, we find historical and social structural features of home communities that are important in preparing individuals for an urban migration and adaptation. Agri-

cultural communities such as the Southwest Pueblos have been somewhat urban for a thousand years so that people who were born and raised in a Pueblo village usually do better in White towns and cities than people from government created reservation villages. The large West Coast fishing villages seem to provide a better urban preparation than a hunting heritage. The Pueblo and coastal Salish have a history of easier urban adaptations than the Blackfoot and Sioux. Both of the latter, for example, have more violent histories. In Oklahoma those who have a tribal level, hunting heritage--such as Kiowa and Comanche--tend to have more problems in urban adaptations than people with a chiefdom level agricultural heritage--such as the Cherokee, Creek, and Choctaw.

LANGUAGES

Using the criterion of self-definition only about 28% of the total Native population (250,000 of 900,000) in the U.S. have a Native first language, as compared to about 43% (300,000 of 700,000) in Canada. Also the survival of viable languages is much higher in Canada.

From a total indigenous North American list of 300 languages, only 45 or 15% are fairly secure (100-1,000 speakers) or secure (more than 1,000 speakers). Somewhere around 35 or 25% of the U.S. list of 141 languages are still viable. Canada, by contrast, has 34 or 68% of the Canadian list of 50 languages still fairly secure or secure. This high Canadian level is probably the highest rate of retention of viable languages for any country in the Western Hemisphere, although in number of aboriginal speakers Canada is far surpassed by areas of aboriginal state societies, such as Mexico and Peru.

The range of those who still spoke their language at any level of competence in surveys in the 1970s was from a low of 62% in Toronto and Vancouver, 70% in Edmonton, 73% in Winnipeg, and up to 100% in hundreds of reserves and crown land communities. Saskatchewan seems to be one of the most conservative provinces in the retention of languages, correlated with features of rural-orientation, racial segregation, and most extreme anti-Indian racism in

Canada (see "Racism" in Price 1979), the largest number of Indians as a proportion of the total population of the province (4.7% are status Indians). The proportion of the total (status and non-status) Indian population in the province who spoke their mother tongue declined from 85% in 1961 to 64% in 1971 (Anderson 1978:66).

In our Los Angeles survey in 1966 (Price 1978:Chapter 10) we found that 54% claimed to be able to speak an Indian language, but only 22% of the urban Indian parents spoke Indian languages in their home. The Canadian data follows the same pattern, so that for example one survey found that only 18% of the Vancouver Indians still use their language in their home (Stanbury and Siegel 1975).

We found in the U.S. that the larger language communities have a slower rate of decline, particularly where large size is combined with a rural setting, as in the Navajo and Hopi cases. In Canada the most viable languages are the large and generally rural groups of Cree (80,000), Ojibwa (60,000), and Inuktitut (20,000), all of which have written literatures in their syllabic writing systems.

The diverse levels of retention of Eskimo languages reflect social policies, school policies, and acculturation pressures: Greenland 100%, Canada 94%, Alaskan Central Yupik 94%, Siberian Yupik 70%, Alaskan Inuit 55%, and Alaskan Pacific Yupik 36% (Krauss in Sebeok 1976). Greenland was broadly supportive of the Native language and the

U.S.S.R. was supportive only in schools. The Canadian Inuit and Central Yupik lacked general or school support, but had weak acculturation pressure. The Alaskan Inuit and Pacific Yupik lacked society and school supports and had strong acculturation pressure. Thus, a language (and culture) can survive even without support from the dominant society and without its use in schools, but only where there is little acculturation pressure. When the acculturation pressure builds up these social and school support systems become crucial for the survival of the language (and culture).

Statistical Review:

	U.S.	Canada
Number of traditional languages (163 total in U.S. and Canada, 28 were in both at some time in history):	141	50
Languages still viable:	ca. 35	34
Percentage still viable:	25%	68%
Use of language by Eskimos	Inuit 55% Central Yupik 94% Pacific Yupik 36%	Inuit 94%
Use of Native language in the home by urban parents:	22%, L.A. 1966	18%, Vancouver, 1971
Use of Native language upon entry into Indian schools:	ca. 30%	60%
Have a Native first language:	ca. 28%	43%

CULTURAL DIFFUSIONS FROM THE
U.S. TO CANADA

International Native movements have historically tended to start in the U.S. and to spread to Canada. Pontiac's confederacy in 1763-1765 and Tecumseh's confederacy in 1811-1813 both spread to Canada. The Longhouse Society and the Code of Handsome Lake began in the U.S. and came to Canada. In the Plains this was true of the horse and the cultural complex around the horse, such as the hunting of buffalo on horseback. It was also true of such important trait complexes as coup counting in warfare, the circular form of ten encampment, the Sun dance, and modern powwow dancing. Peyotism was only briefly practiced in Canada, introduced to the Ojibwa in 1936. The revitalization of the Guardian Ceremonial began in Washington and spread to British Columbia among the Salish. Recently Canada has seen the arrival of such cultural traits as the American Indian Movement, survival schools, and Native studies.

The occurrence of the same trait in the two countries is not necessarily a diffusion and in the field of government policy seems to be commonly an independent development of similar programs when warranted by similar conditions in two evolving societies. The effect, in any case, is that there has tended to be a lag in the evolution

Parliament and later hanged as a revolutionary. The first Indian to be accepted as a Member of Parliament is Len Marchand in 1968. The U.S. has had several Indians as the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, starting with three Iroquois: Ely S. Parker in 1869-71 and then Robert L. Bennet and Louis R. Bruce one century later. Since then, the U.S. has routinely had Indians direct the B.I.A. and promoted the position to an Assistant Secretary of the Department of Interior. Canada, by contrast, has never had an Indian as Minister of Indian and Northern Affairs.

The U.S. organized police ~~forces and courts made up~~ of Indian people in the 1880s to serve on reservations. Indian police forces have been started in Canada only in the last several years and there still are no formal Indian-run courts, although the band councils can act as courts in relation to their own by-laws. Since the 1930s the U.S. has encouraged each tribe to form its own constitution and to define the criteria of its own membership. Canada, through the Indian Act, imposes a single, legal definition on who will be defined as having Indian status. In the U.S. the tribal rolls are maintained primarily by the tribes themselves, while in Canada the comparable band lists are maintained primarily by the federal government.

Since the end of World War II there has been considerable development of a common pan-Indian culture in British North America. Earlier pan-Indian movements tended

of Indian policy in Canada behind the U.S. The lag shows up in the U.S. giving citizenship to Indians in 1924 while Canada withheld citizenship from Native people until 1960. Even when we compare the U.S. states with the Canadian provinces on voting policies, we still see a considerable lag in Canada. Where U.S. states denied the voting franchise to Indians at all those practices were usually ended in the 1940s and 1950s: Arizona--1948, Maine--1954, and some lag due to racism in Utah and New Mexico--1962. The years that full voting rights were obtained in the Canadian provinces were: always--Nova Scotia, N.W.T.; 1949--B.C.; 1954--Ontario; 1960--Yukon, Saskatchewan; 1963--New Brunswick, P.E.I.; 1965--Alberta; and 1969--Quebec. Quebec's lag was due to its lack of Indian policies and not to racism.

In other policies, the U.S. started its Indian Claims Commission in 1946 while Canada started its equivalent only in 1969. The U.S. stopped the prohibition of alcoholic beverages to Indians in 1951 and Canada did so in 1967. The U.S. developed a formal termination policy in 1953 and Canada briefly considered a similar policy in 1969.

The U.S. elected an Indian (Charles Curtis) to the Senate in 1907 and he went on to become the U.S. Vice-President in 1928. The first Indian to be appointed to the Canadian Senate was James Gladstone in 1958, 51 years later. Louis Riel is the first Indian to be elected to the Canadian Parliament. He was refused membership by the

to be just regional inter-tribal movements or the grandiose claims of the associations of small numbers of elite and educated people. That is, "The North American Indian . . ." of whatever was a small group with questionable grass roots support. In the 1950s powwow dancing and Peyotism became established mass-movements among Indians in the U.S., with some minor influences on Canadian Indians. Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Arizona were then the creative centers of British North American pan-Indian Culture. In religion, for example, one thinks of Peyotism from Oklahoma, the great ceremonials of the Pueblos, and the development of Navajo sandpainting and chanting, alongside ~~the secular activities~~ of weaving and "squaw dancing."

In Indian education Arizona and New Mexico were the most advanced states in the 1950s and early 1960s. I was impressed with the sophistication of the Indian teachers at an education conference I attended in Gallup, New Mexico in the summer of 1959. It was held in conjunction with the Intertribal Ceremonials, a spectacular combination of tribal and powwow-style dancing, the likes of which have never been seen in Canada. Arizona State University started its program in Indian education in 1951, eventually developing an M.A. program, and The Journal of American Indian Education. The University of Saskatchewan at Saskatoon was the first to develop a similar Indian education program in Canada in 1960.

Urban Indian centers were initially started in the U.S. by the Society of Friends of the Quaker Church in major west coast cities in the 1950s as a service to skid row Indians. This was the case in Los Angeles and when the Indians took over the center and converted it into more of a middle class institution another church-financed welfare-oriented Indian center took over the task of helping the skid row Indians. An Indian center was started in Winnipeg in 1959, apparently on the model of the earlier U.S. centers. They are usually called "Friendship Centres" in Canada.

The U.S. urban relocation program was followed in a minor way with a similar program still in effect in Canada. The fish-ins in Washington in 1964 and U.S. land claims cases stimulated treaty rights and claim cases in Canada. The Rough Rock Demonstration School of the Navajo started in 1966 was studied by the National Brotherhood of Canada in 1968, whose first major victory was convincing the Canadian government to adopt an Indianized curriculum in Indian schools. The American Indian Movement was started in Minneapolis in 1960 and its chapters spread through southern Canada in the 1970s. Canada's A.I.M. people were active in urban street patrols, militant actions on injustices, occupations, and marches. A couple of the A.I.M. style "survival schools" still struggle on in Canada.

The U.S. has recently had a series of fundamental

laws and policy actions, while Canada has moved extremely slowly for a whole decade in reviewing possible changes in its Indian Act. Canada has nothing comparable to such U.S. legislation as (1) the Indian Bill of Rights in 1968, (2) the American Indian Policy Review Commission of 1975-76, (3) the Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978, or (4) the Indian Child Welfare Act of 1978.

Of course Canada has not usually observed the U.S. changes and just imitated them. The diffusion of social movements or even government programs is a subtle spread of ideas as well as changes based on similar local innovations to resolve similar problems that arise. It is never very clear how important the parallel inventions are in similar situations. Generally, though we can see that the Canadian lag occurs not just in policies but also in acculturation, modernization, and urbanization of the Native population.

There have been recent Canadian innovations: (1) Native communications in radio and television, (2) new forms of National politics, (3) new forms of adaptations to bush life, and (4) participation in international movements of indigenous peoples, both political and artistic. The Native protest movement is now stronger than in the U.S. and Canadians will probably lead in the 1980s in art (Inuit, West Coast, Ojibwa-Cree) and theater ('Ksan and the drama groups in Edmonton and Toronto).

The following lists of firsts shows a median lag of

Canada behind the U.S. by about ten years in the introduction of similar Native cultural traits and about twenty years in the introduction of similar governmental policies. The amount of lag, however, has also been declining over time. We might now expect many Canadian Indian innovations to begin influencing changes in the U.S. Indians.

Review of Firsts:

	U.S.	Canada
<u>Native Culture</u>		
Horse and horse culture:	1650	1730
Historic Peyote rites:	1885	
Native American Church:	1918	1936
Salish Guardian Spirit Ceremonial:	1950s-- Washington	1967--B.C.
Indian Economical Conference:	1970--Crow	1971--Stoney
Modern association not based on tribal affinity:	1879	1909
Labor Union:	none	1914
Commercially successful Indian art:	1919--Santa Fe, Taos	1949--Inuit sculpture
Women's association:	1920s--Seattle	1937--Red Pheasant, Sask. 1939--Vancouver
Urban Indian center:	ca. 1950	1959--Winnipeg
Indian education B.A.:	1951--Arizona State	1960--Saskatchewan
Indian-run school:	1966--Rough Rock	1970--Blue Quills

Review of Firsts.--continued

	U.S.	Canada
Indian-run community college:	1969--Navajo	1971--Blackfoot
Native Studies department:	1969--Minnesota	1969--Trent
Survival School:	1971	1976
Large scale, pan-Indian, occupation:	1964	1974
Nation-wide caravan:	1972	1974
Pulitzer Prize:	1969	none
Restaurant:	Cherokee in Oklahoma	1972--Haida in Vancouver
Bank:	1973	none

Government

Reservation:	1656	1645
Treaties:	1778-1868	1781-1923
Indian as head of Indian Affairs:	1869--Parker	none
Potlatch or spirit dancing outlawed:	1871--Washington	1884-1951--B.C.
Indian police forces:	1880	1970s
Indian operated courts:	1883	none
Indian in senate:	1907--Curtis	1958--Gladstone
Indian in lower house: (Louis Riel was elected in 1874 to the Canadian Parliament, but was not allowed to serve.)	1944--Stigler	1968--Marchand
Citizenship:	1924	1960

Review of Firsts.--continued

	U.S.	Canada
Formal policy on per capita grants to public and private schools per Indian student:	1934	1954
Land claims commission:	1946	1969
Urban relocation program:	1952	1957
Termination policy:	1953	1969
Native children who are adopted have a legal right to retain their Indian status:	1978	1975

POLICIES

The U.S. and Canadian systems of government are quite different, particularly in the degree of separation between the executive and legislative branches of government, the separation being much greater in the U.S. In Canada the ministers of the executive departments are also elected legislators. This means that Indian policy in Canada is more subject to shifting political climates and federal cabinet decisions than in the U.S. U.S. Indian policy is much more ~~explicit, more statutory, than Canadian~~ Indian policy. Thus it ~~takes several volumes to describe~~ all the federal Indian laws of the U.S. while the Indian Act of Canada is contained in a small booklet. This means that the Canadian ministries have more latitude of action than the U.S. bureaucracies. The difference is not just due to the two styles of government. For example, the U.S. government has a history of greater appreciation of the unique problems of individual Indian societies than Canada, which has tended to treat all Indians alike, as if the fifty aboriginal societies of Canada were culturally homogeneous. Thus many U.S. laws refer to the special problems of single Indian societies.

The U.S. Indian policy is guided more than in Canada by a large body of legal statutes, bureaucratic procedures, and judicial decisions. Assignment as Minister of Indian

Affairs in Canada is simply a political act, principally by the Prime Minister. Thus people who know nothing about Indian Affairs are routinely appointed and they usually rotate in a year or so to a better ministry. Indian Affairs is considered to be one of the worst ministry assignments because it has a heavy work load, a great many problems, and a particularly complaining constituency.

In the U.S. the appointment to the head of Indian Affairs is more minor, more technical, and a longer lasting assignment. It is political to the degree that the appointee is at least not clearly allied with the opposition party, and in the last decade has been an Indian. In Canada, by contrast, there has never been an Indian in charge of Indian Affairs, in part because only four Natives have ever been elected as Members of Parliament.

The same difference applies to treaties. The U.S. made 370 treaties with Indians from 1778 to 1868, when they just stopped calling their land cession arrangements "treaties." In 1871 Congress officially stopped dealing with Indians through treaties, shifted to relationships defined by statute laws, said that Indians were not separate from the U.S., and reaffirmed the rights based on treaties then in force. Where treaties were not made the U.S. courts have generally made land claim case settlements to the Indians for the value of the land at the time that the land was effectively taken from the Indians, such as 1853

in California and 1862 in Nevada. The awards have thus been quite small because the land was worth only pennies an acre at the time.

The British in Canada and the Canadians have only made a couple dozen treaties. While the Americans have been very involved and manipulative about Indians and Indian lands and resources through laws and treaties; the British and British Canadians have been more socially distant, more physically segregating, more colonial in the use of White personnel over Indians in Indian communities, and more uniform and thus less tolerant of cultural differences in their policies and administration over the Indians. The land trust relationship that is at the core of Indian policies, however, is quite similar in the two countries.

The parallel features of U.S. and Canadian government relations with Indians in the 1970s are that (1) there was a massive increase in the amount of money being spent on Indian programs; (2) termination policies were tried and rejected so soundly that terms such as "termination" and "assimilation" are now carefully avoided and urban "relocation" is described in such terms as "employment mobility"; (3) the federal land trust and tax-free status of Indian land was reemphasized; and (4) the monopoly over Indian affairs that was held by the traditional federal Indian agency (B.I.A. and D.I.A.N.D.) was broken by the entry of dozens of other federal and state-provincial agencies

delivering a wide variety of specialized services: employment, housing, resource development, business advice, conservation, etc. The non-D.I.A.N.D. portion of the Canadian federal budget on Indians increased from 15% in 1974 to 21% in 1979. The non-B.I.A. proportion were of the U.S. federal budget was 44% in 1974.

The U.S. and Canada governments were different in the 1970 in that the U.S. created a great volume of new Indian legislation and court decisions while Canadians argued extensively on how to modify the simple little Indian Act, contained in a 40 page booklet that came out in 1951. The U.S. Indian laws are voluminous and are explicit guides to the administrators while in Canada Indian policy is more susceptible to changes in political and administrative actions. Fortunately, the 1970s have been an excellent decade for federal Indian government programs in Canada. The current estimated annual federal budget spent on Indians on a per capita basis (of the major serviced populations) is just slightly less in Canada (\$3,105 U.S. funds) than in the U.S. (\$3,333), in spite of the greater variety of U.S. programs.

	U.S.	Canada
1974 Budgets, millions of dollars		
Central Indian agency	\$583	\$393 Can.
Other Federal expenditures	\$464--44%	\$ 71 Can. 15%
Total	\$1,047	\$464 Can.
1978-79 total		\$829 Can.
1980-81	ca. \$2,000	ca. \$1,096 Can.
Major serviced populations:	600,000	300,000
Per capita serviced, U.S. dollars:	\$3,333	\$3,105 U.S. \$3,653 Can.

It appears that ~~Canada has had a higher rate of in-~~crease in its total federal budget for Indian programs than the U.S. Over the last few years, increases have been about 10% per year in the U.S. and 15% per year in Canada. Federal Indian funding as a percentage of the total U.S. budget in 1974 was \$1,047.4 million of \$310.0 billion or 0.34% (Bureau of Indian Affairs 1975:11). Federal Indian funding as a percentage of the total Canadian federal budget in 1978-79 was \$829 million of 47.6 billion or 1.7% (Indian and Northern Affairs 1980:108). So as a proportion of the total federal budget, Canada spends five times more of its federal budget on Indians than the U.S.

Of course, the proportion of the Native population is also greater in Canada than in the U.S. so let us bring that into the calculation as well. The U.S. spends 0.34%

of its budget essentially on 0.3% (the enrolled and serviced Native population of 600,000) of its population, a ratio of 1:1.1. Canada spends 1.7% of its budget essentially on 1.3% (300,000 status Indians and Inuit) of its population, a ratio of about 1:1.3, very similar, but about a 16% greater financial effort than in the U.S.

Both governments have conflicts of interest within the central Indian administration: The B.I.A. with Parks and Forests within Interior and Indian and Inuit Affairs with Parks and Northern Affairs within D.I.A.N.D.

Urban Indian centers in Canada are more numerous (71) than in the U.S. (about 49 in the U.S.) and are more financially secure because of a large scale federal funding, principally from the Secretary of State's core funding. There are also some well founded ancillary services, such as courtworkers and annual granted programs to combat alcoholism. Urban housing programs have been doing well in Toronto and Winnipeg. The following figures show that there is a great contrast in the proportions of the enrolled populations living off their trust lands: 50% in the U.S. and 28% in Canada. However, the proportions of the total Native populations living off trust lands are essentially the same, and point to the more restrictive definition of status Indian in Canada, and the smaller size of trust lands in Canada.

	U.S.	Canada
Enrolled Natives living on trust lands:	300,000--50%	216,000--72%
Enrolled Natives living off trust lands:	300,000--50%	84,000--28%
Non-enrolled Natives living off trust lands:	300,000--100%	400,000--100%
Total Natives living off trust lands:	600,000--67%	484,000--69%

The pattern of Native voluntary associations and newspapers are similar in the types developed in the two countries. My list has over 400 formal associations in each country. My lists of Indian periodicals show 81 in Canada and 188 in the U.S. Canada does not have as much proliferation of tribally specific associations or periodicals, but does have strong regional or province-wide associations and periodicals. The major national newspaper in Canada is the government's own Indian News while two private newspapers predominate in the U.S.: Akwesasne Notes and Wassaja.

Other Comparisons:

	U.S.	Canada
Life expectancy	65	60 males 66 females
Infant mortality	2.4% (1971)	1.3% neonatal 1.5% post- neonatal
		<u>2.8% (1978)</u>
Primary cause of death	accidents	accidents
Accidental deaths per 100,000	183	
Violent deaths per 100,000:		
vehicle--		60.5
burns--		23.6
firearms--		21.4
poisoning--		14.9
suicides--	21.8 (1971)	30.1
other--		91.3
Total		<u>241.8 (1976)</u>
Birth rate per 100:	3.3 (1971)	2.9 (1976)
Indian Health Service budget in millions	\$248 (1974)	\$102 Canadian (1978-79)
Native:non Native arrest ratio:		5.4:1
Native:non-Native crime rate ratio:	1.5:1	
Native:non-Native rural violent crime rate ratio:	7.4:1	
Indian ancestry of employees in the central Indian agency:	62%	26%
Average years of formal education of adults:	ca. 10	ca. 8
Approximate current high school graduation rate:	60%	20%
Average income, family of five	\$7,865 1970 census	\$4,417 1971 census

REFERENCES

- Anderson, Alan B.
1978 Linguistic Trends Among Saskatchewan Ethnic Groups. In Ethnic Canadians, edited by M. L. Kovacs. Regina: University of Regina.
- Bureau of Indian Affairs
1975 The American Indians: Answers to 101 Questions. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Printing Office.
- Indian and Northern Affairs
1980 Indian Conditions: A Survey. Ottawa.
- Price, John A.
1978 Native Studies: American and Canadian Indians. Toronto: McGraw-Hill of Canada.

1979 Indians of Canada: Cultural Dynamics. Toronto: Prentice-Hall of Canada.

1980 Government Policies and Programs Related to Urban Indians: An Analysis of the American Experience. Toronto: Institute for Research on Public Policy. 66 pp. Ms.
- Stanbury, William T. and Jay Siegel
1975 Success and Failure: Indians in Urban Society. Vancouver: University of British Columbia.
- Sebeck, Thomas A., editor
1976-77 Indian Languages of the Americas. Vols, 1 and 2. New York: Plenum Press.

SUMMARY AND COMMENT

by

Alfonso Ortiz

I, too, would like to begin with the most recent discussion, if only because it is freshest. I will work backward from John Price's presentation. As I read and listened to Professor Price, I note that he addresses us on at least three levels: ethnographic, ethnohistorical, and statistical. He has also added a theoretical perspective employing cultural evolutionary models of social development. As I read the paper, trying to be sympathetic, I thought at the time that perhaps I did not understand what I saw in print. I thought that he might be able to fit these diverse parts together by reading his interpretation.

He has failed to do so with three disparate themes of phenomena presented concurrently, but never coming together. In his ethnohistorian-ethnographer muse, I have the utmost respect for his work. He has gathered data carefully and has analysed it as far as one can go. But in his Kirkegaardian leap-frogging muse, with claims based upon the extremely narrow strand of anthropology represented by cultural evolutionary theory, I must state my objections. Speaking for myself as a professional anthropologist, I would be drawn and quartered for endorsing such a frail and simple theory that represents a small fraction of the profession, but which has enough supporters to be dangerous.

I say this because I've long considered the simple up-from-darkness strain of thought still found in some sectors of anthropology as overly facile and misleading. This strain of thought assumes that there is a persistent tendency for simple societies to want to creep up from darkness toward civilization, with cultural evolutionary theoreticians at the apex of development, of course. Everything that I'm interested in professionally

falls through the webbing provided by this theory. Let's analyse this and limit ourselves to the band, the tribe, and ultimately the state.

I think, to clear the air immediately -- and history will bear me out in reference to the American Indian -- that in many, many instances, the tribe is not the necessary "waystation" along the road to statehood, but rather, a device for avoiding the state altogether. So are the band and the chiefdom. There are so many words we can play with endlessly, all leading into semantic jungles. I'm delighted, John, that your stepladder of progress tells you something about selective epochs in the history of Indian-White relations. I myself find this evolutionary step-ladder of no utility for answering any questions of enduring consequence for my kind of anthropology. I'm pleased that it has helped you pick your way through the history of Indian-White relations.

I will give you the benefit of one carefully selected example. In the modern "emergent" Navajo Nation we see a people who are 150,000 strong who are grappling with all of the problems of a developing state. Yet they are doing so with a basic consciousness of pre-1922 band heritage and a post-1922 tribal consciousness. In 1922 things changed, because they came together to consider signing oil leases. Tribal identity as "Navajo" has been especially important in the twentieth century as "Navajoness" competes with or is compared to "Zuniness" or "Hopiness." Today you have the three going together complimenting, supporting, and in some ways impeding one another. In this, I find that evolutionary framework totally useless. Similarly, it does not help me in the least in

understanding the reality rather than the conjecture -- the reality of the Navajos as a people in the Southwest. They were band level peoples who were never subjugated until the Anglo conquest of the Southwest. In their case, as well as in the case of various bands of the Apaches in the nineteenth century, the band level was the all-important mechanism that kept them alive as resistors of American conquest. This evolutionary scheme about bands does not tell me a thing about why they were so heroic in their resistance to United States military occupation of the Southwest.

I am not contending that all theorizing about social organization is without validity. But, let not the generalizations be so facile as to cause most of the complex problems about what Indian people have been, are, and continue to be fall out from between the interface of history as it actually happened and the theory which purports to explain that history. Therein lies the problem.

As for the statistical portrait presented by Professor Price, I waited to see what any of this has to do with urban Indians in modern society. I waded through all of this wondering if this could amount to more than a hill of Carter peanuts. Although you have assembled the data, Professor Price, you have not boiled out the important meanings of these statistics. None of them are really surprising to me -- the lag between Indian themes in Canada and the United States, the tendency to emulate what goes on down here, the complexity and greater diversity of Indian peoples in the United States as compared with Canada, and

the sheer larger population here that has resulted historically in a ten to twenty year faster period of adjustment to common problems here than in Canada.

The problem with facile theories as exemplified by the evolutionists is that as long as one accepts their premises -- and one is presented with striking examples -- it seems to explain a great deal within a very parsimonious framework and many subtle devices. Closer scrutiny reveals that the notion of "cooption" is inappropriate in some cases Professor Price cited as evidence of support for his evolutionary ladder. Take the Cherokees, for example. He should not have mentioned that tribe at all. The Cherokee people were not coopted. They were brutally rounded up as a result of the gold and land hunger of Georgians and other southern settlers. The achievement model for explaining why they were removed simply does not hold water. If one looks at the documentary sources relevant to Cherokee history in the first third of the nineteenth century in the Old Southeast, one can find as many -- if not more -- outstanding examples of the exact opposite argument to cooption as you have brought to our attention in support of such a theory.

So what does this exercise become? In my opinion it is just a game among scholars which detracts our energies from the issues we have assembled to discuss here today. That's enough on this. I want all of the audience to understand -- Indian and non-Indian, anthropologists and non-anthropologists -- that there are many anthropologists who do not buy the evolutionists' approach to the study of tribal societies. In respect to John Price, I

must admonish him for his intellectually well-motivated and honestly-presented paper. I, and many others like myself, just do not agree with the initial premises nor the conclusions based upon the theoretical model he uses.

Returning to the beginning and Sol Tax's very well-informed statements and warnings, I won't dwell on Dr. Tax's presentation. As always, he presented his material in context with a lifetime of experience of work among American Indians. His point that we respect the diversity and complexity of Indian peoples and issues should be remembered. We always need to be reminded of that. There are far too many "lumpers" around us, including scholars who write or say, "The Indians this" and "The Indians that." We need to remember that specific Indian Peoples differ just as tribal anthropologists differ over what historical events mean. There are honest differences that often are over-simplified for the sake of convenience.

We need to also remember Professor Tax's point that Indian survival and cultural pride is as much a survival of the spirit as much as it is anything else. There again, the evolutionary thinkers can not accommodate this factor in their discussions of Indian behavior and social organization.

I do not want to risk the loss of the force of Sol Tax's response to Virgil Vogel's question of whether or not this is still a factor to be concerned about. Dr. Tax, with his great, great wisdom, the result of fifty years of experience of working with Indians answered, "Yes, there still is a termination policy and always will be as long as there is an America." I would like

to commend Sol for that statement and make the observation that it takes enough experience and enough reading to understand that as long as we persist in remaining separate, there will continue to be pressure on Indian people with the goal of terminating distinctiveness, especially in the area of land holding. The entire weight of history is pointed in that direction in this country. Call it what you will. After extermination and conquest, coupled with removal in some parts of the country, relocation, termination, "self-development," and most recently, "self-determination," the underlying motives have always been the same: to cause Indian communities to cease to exist. One can sugarcoat policy with words such as "self-determination," but those who control the purse continue to pull and push, and in essence, manipulate Indian peoples. The dominant thrust remains -- submergence -- cultural, linguistic, and economic submergence -- by those in the American mainstream, whatever that may be at the time in question. It's the wisdom of Dr. Tax's response that we do not want to lose.

Moving on, Russell Thornton, with his adept ability to deal with quantitative social data, sounded several warnings and observations worth remembering. It's important to repeat several of these. First of all, it was a good thing for Thornton to remind us that urbanization is not something that suddenly happened in the 1930s. The partnership of the Indian and urbanization goes back beyond the the 1930s and only the more contemporary visible trends date back to the 1930s. As Thornton pointed out, the Pueblos, Mayans and Aztecs were urban peoples long before

Europeans set foot in the Western Hemisphere. We should also keep in mind that the Hopewell and Adena peoples, as well as Mississippian societies were urbanized Indians.

Another thing Thornton brought to the surface that merits repeating is that the modern urbanization of American Indians has its roots in the role of small off-reservation complexes where people migrated for one reason or another due to the fact that Bureau of Indian Affairs offices were located in these centers. In the case of the Southwest, Phoenix, Tucson and Albuquerque are outstanding examples of such urban complexes that attracted large numbers of Indian peoples tied to the B. I. A. for various reasons. These centers were mere stepping stones to larger cities, as Thornton pointed out, but they are important to remember as bridges between the reservations and the larger outside world.

The other point that Thornton made that I would like to stress is that Indians travel to the cities more than they migrate. One can manipulate census data in a variety of ways, and I wonder if there truly are more Indians in cities than on reservations and in rural communities; or, are we merely seeing the travelers rather than the fully-urbanized Indians in the official censuses? The point is that Indian movements are highly fluid and dynamic; much more complex than the picture one gets by merely looking at United States Census Office final reports.

Charlotte Heth's case study using her own family is a good place to turn for examples of how fluid Indian migration truly is. Her parents moved to Los Angeles but, as soon as they retired, they promptly returned to their home in Oklahoma. This trend has

accelerated in the 1970s and I question whether the census data can give a true portrait of that movement in the 1980 statistics. Beginning with Lyndon Johnson's "Great Society" programs in 1964 when the war on poverty began in earnest, the various programs designed to increase economic opportunities opened the floodgates to a plethora of programs by many federal agencies -- Commerce, Labor, and HEW in particular -- all setting up programs for Indian people (as well as other minorities). With these changes came the need for educated, skilled, acculturated people to administer and perform skilled tasks similar to the American mainstream.

In the Southwest, an area of vast reservations and the region I know best, many Navajo, Apache, Pima, Papago and Pueblo peoples who had migrated to Los Angeles heard the call for administrators and technically-skilled professionals and saw in these programs an opportunity to return home. In both the San Francisco-Oakland and Los Angeles regions, these Indian people welcomed the opportunity to return to their respective communities on a non-vacationing basis to staff the Head Start Program, the Community Action programs, the WIC Programs, CETA, and an incredible number of other programs whose acronyms very nearly span the alphabet. This represented a reverse of the out-migration to the cities. These are skilled and talented people. In my own community of San Juan Pueblo we went from a population of 720 in April of 1964 to around 1,200 today -- almost double. This was not the result of the birth rate. It was because there were several hundred of our people in California who were beginning to decide that the

California dream was dying -- at least for them. They therefore came home to work on soft-money programs. This was a welcome change for these skilled and talented members of the community who came home to earn decent wages. Whether these jobs will last or not depends upon which turkey we elect for president. Both are dangerous in my view, and we stand to lose many of these valuable programs across Indian America no matter who is in office. For the present they have good jobs and, reservation by reservation, this phenomenon is quantifiable, and an honest and sincere example of out-migrants preference to live and work in the home community.

This is not a counterargument to Ann Metcalf's study of the Bay area. Not in the least. California is a very special case. It is still an increasingly urbanized state and Indian people along with non-Indians are part of the move to California's growing cities. Many have found, especially in southern California, that the quality of life suffers and they have therefore returned to their reservations where circumstances in the way of job opportunities enable them to do so. Throughout the Pueblos, and what little I know of the Navajo and Apache situations, this is true. The jobs are there. Whether they will last or not remains to be seen.

Russell Thornton, Charlotte Heth and Ann Metcalf all pointed out an important trend that is worthy of remembering, and that is the migration from east to west. Thornton and Professor Garbarino added to our understanding of this by pointing out the increasing hyphenization of names that may lead to more and more people calling themselves "Indian" rather than one tribal name or another.

This may become more apparent in the cities among people who are torn between two, three, four or more tribal identities. Instead of causing problems for one parent or another, they call themselves Indians.

The phenomenon of Indians heading west or south as pointed out by Charlotte Heth is a good observation. And this will undoubtedly continue. However, I doubt that once Indians who have migrated to the south, southwest or west coast for employment and leave places in the north such as Montana and North Dakota, they'll return there for retirement, given the severity of the winter weather.

Insofar as Ann Metcalf pointed out, there is an increasing grandparental population in California -- this is perfectly reasonable. Retirement for many of these people near or with their children in the Bay area or in southern California makes modern sense. Eventually the presently-imbalanced age group urban Indian population that has more young than old will undoubtedly even out some. But, to echo Russell Thornton again before going on, I would like to emphasize the importance of taking the statistics not with a salt shaker, but with a barrel of salt. Indian people have never really held still and behaved the way people have who have been molded into formulas for the evolutionary theorists, for census takers, or for whomever. They have never stood still long enough for what those trained in standard frames of reference want as subjects for statistical portraits. I think of the extreme -- the Indian who has no job, no income, no address, no street name. There are many such

Indians in the country and it is that sort of person whether in South Dakota, Michigan or New Mexico that will not get counted in the official census. It would be of great service to Indian people in general if someone would come up with a way of getting an approximately accurate census.

Merwyn Garbarino's second example -- the woman from the Southwest who lived in a Black neighborhood -- is a good case in point of the type of person who is not likely to get counted in the U. S. Census every ten years. Multiply that by thousands and there are significant numbers that affect overall Indian undercounting and, consequently, funded deficiencies. Many Indian people are so individualistic that they will never be counted. Other groups do not conform to standard categories of measurement. If anyone can find a way to circumvent this, it would be of tremendous value to Indian people. We are always grossly undercounted.

I'm sorry Professor Garbarino is not here for my comment because, even though I did not plan it this way, my scolding remarks were not meant to address White anthropologists. I want to say, and I would have said this with or without Professor Garbarino present, that what struck me about the presentation was how utterly absent cultural and linguistic considerations were in her view of the pre-1970s Indian migration and adjustment in the city of Chicago.

Indians are not just like Polish, Irish and Italian immigrants. Her statement that the problems Indians faced in Chicago have been no different from any other rural or immigrant group pro-

foundly shocked me. Without lapsing into romantic mish-mash, Indians are not like other immigrants or other rural peoples. That is exactly the point. Scholarly research points this out to us. Those of us who are Indian know that we are very special people, for better or for worse. I say that not emotionally but with all of the support that scholarship can muster. I cheered Chauncina White Horse for her corrective remarks on this matter. We have had a very good conference, but it could have been better had we better identified the issues.

Most of us here are scholars and we carry on discourse with one another from our various disciplinary stances, paring and thrusting here, retreating when necessary. We owe it to those who are not scholars to identify what the issues are about Indians who happen to live in cities. Why is the question interesting? What topics of research does such a conference generate? How can Indians and scholars meeting to discuss urban experiences mutually benefit? Ann Metclaf's paper was a refreshing breeze in that regard. It was bristling with questions as well as data and accomplishments.

Let me say that California -- especially northern California -- is interesting and refreshing in that they have been experimenting, right from the very beginning. From the 1950s on, there have been various efforts to make a better life there, to erect institutions that will support their efforts to build better and more meaningful lives in an urban-suburban context. Perhaps that has come because of the newness of California for so many of its people from the postwar years on to the present time. I don't know what accounts for it, and perhaps Ann can help us here, but

some have disdainfully called it "instant lifestyle" in reference to the whole Bay area. But it's reflected in an honest, and I think a realistic, experimental dedication that has resulted in good institutions. The various urban Indian centers of that area are some of the best run and most interesting in the country.

Had Merwyn Garbarino taken a look at Chicago or any other major city with a large Indian population in the 1960s and 1970s I think her presentation could have been improved considerably. As it is, she missed asking many very important questions and her sample from the 1950s is a very incomplete sample of the total. The fact that a person is an Apache from Arizona or a Cherokee from North Carolina definitely affects how they react and adjust to a city like Chicago. This is one of the most interesting of all questions possible to ask of the urban Indian experience. Does the fact that someone is a Sioux from Pine Ridge influence how that person adjusts to or washes out of a big, noisy, dirty and often hostile environment such as Chicago? What does the sort of Indianness that a particular person or family evinces when they come to the city have to do with their reaction and adjustment to the city? I think that Professor Garbarino, in making her research years ago, took down information as to how Indians were living at the time, totally ignoring where they came from and how their cultural backgrounds influenced their situations in the city. This led to a misunderstanding on her part and a one-dimensional portrait in her analysis. I did not see any cultural sensitivity in her presentation and, as both a cultural anthropologist and an Indian, I found that shameful.

Chauncina White Horse can be my clan-mother any day. I would be proud to have you as a clan-mother or as a mother. She gave us what Sol Tax referred to in his opening remarks as "the spirit." The very best of us rests in the Indian spirit of America. May your own tribe increase and may your own road of life stretch very far into the future and the spiritworld. You spoke about people and issues that those of us who began life on reservations but who have traveled many roads, many worlds since (including cities), know to be true. So many of the presentations missed this dimension today. You told us something very profound and significant; something I hope will not be lost sight of and something that that wiley old coyote who runs this establishment, Fritz Jennings, picked up on. You gave us glimpses of lives of people who, to Indian people who know them may not seem extraordinary, but to the Indian children in the schools who still have to read about Dick and Jane and red fire engines and fairy godmothers and Puritan scenes with manicured lawns in the East that have little to do with their heritage, it would be very important to them that some of these lives be more widely available in the form of biographies for the schools. These examples of successful adjustment to the cities are important for all of us. These are people who were not written up in the papers but who show the other side to what Merwyn Garbarino focused upon -- the maladjustment, the tragic side of relocation. Those who go about the business of just plain coping don't make good copy by standards of American journalism, however dramatic or successful their efforts. You've mentioned several such lives and I hope they find their way into

print, especially for young Indians who desperately need role models to read about. They will undoubtedly have to grapple with many of the same problems Mrs. White Horse and her friends did in the 1920s and 1930s in adjusting to the city, and this would give them assurance that successful adaptation is possible.